1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA PLAINTIFF
5	VERSUS CAUSE NO. 3:16-cv-00489-CWR-JCG
6	THE HINDS COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, HINDS COUNTY SHERIFF, ET AL. DEFENDANTS
7	HINDS COUNTY SHERIFF, ET AL.
8	
9	VIDEOCONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE CARLTON W. REEVES,
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE, FEBRUARY 9, 2021,
11	JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI
12	
13	(Appearances noted herein.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	REPORTED BY:
22	CANDICE S. CRANE, RPR, CCR #1781
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 501 E. Court Street, Suite 2.500
24	Jackson, Mississippi 39201 Telephone: (601)608-4187
25	

APPEARANCES VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE: 1 2 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: 3 CHRISTOPHER N. CHENG, ESQ. AARON FLEISHER, ESQ. 4 SARAH STEEGE, ESQ. LORA COWALL, ESQ. 5 HELEN VERA, ESQ. MITZI DEASE PAIGE, ESQ. 6 FOR THE DEFENDANTS: 7 CLAIRE BARKER, ESQ. 8 TONY GAYLOR, ESQ. RAYFORD G. CHAMBERS, ESQ. 9 ALSO PRESENT: 10 ELIZABETH SIMPSON 11 DAVID PARRISH JIM MOESER 12 RICHARD DUDLEY SHERIFF LEE VANCE 13 UNDERSHERIFF ALAN WHITE CHIEF DEPUTY ERIC WALL 14 WARDEN RICK FIELDER SYNARUS GREEN 15 LESLIE FAITH JONES MIRANDA BOLEF 16 JODY E. OWENS, II CREDELL M. CALHOUN 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	Style and appearances1-2
3	By Ms. Simpson
4	By Mr. Parrish 11
5	By Mr. Moeser
6	By Dr. Dudley 54
7	By Ms. Simpson 57
8	By Mr. Cheng 67
9	By Mr. Gaylor 79
10	By Ms. Barker 84
11	By Mr. Gaylor 92
12	By Ms. Barker 96
13	By Mr. Owens
14	By Mr. Cheng
15	Court Reporter's Certificate
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
PROCEEDINGS VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE, FEBRUARY 9, 2021
 1
 2
 3
            THE COURT: Good morning. Who's on? Can you hear me
    fine?
 4
 5
           MR. CHENG: Yes. Yes, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. Who's on for the
 6
7
    government?
           MR. CHENG: This is Christopher Cheng.
 8
 9
            I also have my colleagues Aaron Fleisher,
    F-l-e-i-s-h-e-r --
10
11
            THE COURT: Okay. Hold on, please. Hold on for one
12
    second. Mr. Cheng, you say you're on and Ms. Fleisher?
           MR. CHENG: Mr. Aaron Fleisher.
13
            THE COURT: Mr. Aaron Fleisher. I'm sorry.
14
15
           MR. FLEISHER: Good morning, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: Good morning.
16
17
           MR. CHENG: Sarah Steege. That's S-a-r-a-h, last name
18
    is S-t-e-e-q-e.
19
            Helen Vera, her last name is V-e-r-a.
20
            Lora Cowall, C-o-w-a-l-l.
21
            And from the U.S. Attorney's Office, Mitzi Dease Paige,
    P-a-i-g-e.
22
23
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. Who's on for the County?
24
           MS. SUMMERS: I think they went away.
25
            THE COURT: No one's on for the County?
```

```
Who's on for the sheriff?
 1
            MR. CHAMBERS: Your Honor, Ray Chambers and Tony Gaylor
 2
    is on the line, too, for the County. I'm sorry.
 3
            THE COURT: Mr. Chambers and Mr. Gaylor.
 4
            Who is on for the sheriff?
 5
            MS. BARKER: Claire Barker for the sheriff's office.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: And are there -- are there any parties --
 8
    are there any parties here as well?
 9
            MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor. For the sheriff's
    office, we have Sheriff Vance in the room, Undersheriff White,
10
11
    Chief Deputy Wall, and Warden Fielder.
12
            THE COURT: Warden -- if you could you spell the last
13
    name?
14
            MS. BARKER: Fielder, F-i-e-l-d-e-r.
            THE COURT: And what is the undersheriff's first name?
15
    I see you said the last name is White.
16
17
            MS. BARKER: Alan White and Chief Deputy Eric Wall.
18
            THE COURT: Any county officials available or on the
19
    line or present? Are there any county officials -- in
20
    addition to the sheriff's department, are there any county
2.1
    officials on the line?
22
            MR. CHAMBERS: No, Your Honor. Your Honor, Mr. Gaylor
23
    is having a little trouble with his connection. He's trying
24
    to get back in right now, I think.
25
            THE COURT: Okay. And I -- I'm sorry. Mr. Gaylor, you
```

```
1
    made it back on?
 2
            Who are my monitors on the line? I know I see a
    couple. I see three of you, at least.
 3
           MS. SIMPSON: Yes, Your Honor. This is Lisa Simpson,
 4
 5
    the monitor, and my team is present: Dave Parrish, Jim
    Moeser, and Dr. Richard Dudley.
 6
 7
            THE COURT:
                       Okay. All right. We're here for the
    status conference. Now, I can't see everyone because I assume
 8
 9
    some people are calling in and not utilizing Zoom or whatever
    we made available to you. I think we made Zoom or either the
10
11
    other thing that we use here at the court, so ...
12
           MS. PAIGE: It was Zoom, Your Honor. It was Zoom.
13
            THE COURT: It was Zoom, okay. Thank you.
14
            So, Mr. Gaylor, are you connected?
15
           MR. GAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. Can you hear me?
            THE COURT: Okay. Yes. All right.
16
17
           MR. GAYLOR: Yes. I apologize for our technical
18
    difficulties at the County. We are still experiencing them.
    That's why my video is not working.
19
20
            THE COURT: Okay. Are there any county -- I think I
21
    asked this question, but I just want -- well, Mr. Chambers
22
    answered it. No county officials are -- no county officials
23
    are present?
24
           MR. GAYLOR: No county officials.
25
            THE COURT: Okay. The county administrator is not
```

```
present?
 1
 2
            MR. GAYLOR: No, Your Honor, she's not on the call.
 3
            THE COURT: Who is the county administrator? I know it
    has changed since we last spoke.
 4
            MR. GAYLOR: It's Ms. Scherrie Prince. She's the
 5
 6
    acting county attorney until another one is appointed.
 7
                       She's the acting county administrator?
            THE COURT:
 8
           MR. GAYLOR: Administrator, I apologize. Yes.
 9
            THE COURT: Is there any particular reason why the
    county officials are not present? I mean, they've been
10
11
    present before, I think.
12
            MR. GAYLOR: There -- I don't believe there is a
13
    particular reason. In fact, I can still try and reach the
    board president, which (AUDIO GAP) last month, so, you know,
14
15
    people are still getting a little adjusted to their new roles.
16
            THE COURT: Okay. The new -- the board presidency has
17
    changed.
18
           MR. GAYLOR: Yes.
19
            THE COURT: The current president is now Supervisor
    Calhoun?
20
2.1
            MR. GAYLOR: Supervisor Calhoun. Yes, Your Honor.
22
            THE COURT:
                        Okay.
23
            MR. GAYLOR: And so I'll make sure I get him located.
24
            THE COURT: Okay. It's been several months, and if at
25
    any time anyone does not hear me or understand what I am
```

saying, please ask me to repeat it or whatever.

2.1

If you are not speaking, I ask that you place your microphones on mute so that you won't hear any feedback of any kind or no disturbances from where you are sitting.

It's been many months since we last got together. I think it was back in June. So we -- so our last status conference I believe was in June, and I know we've had at least two reports to have been submitted since that last one. The most recent report is of December 4th, 2020. There was one that was submitted I think prior to that, and we did not hold a status conference after having received it.

The status report was submitted on August 4th, 2020, and now we have received this one on December the 4th, 2020, and the purpose of this is to find out where we are, where the County is with respect to the issues that are germane to the oversight of the Hinds County detention centers or facilities which are the subject of the lawsuit that was filed.

So it may take just a little bit longer to get through today's proceedings than usual because we did not have the other hearing, but I do believe what is covered in the report of December, to the extent -- I think it might just be appropriate to talk about what's in the December report because it follows up on what was submitted back in August.

Unless the monitors or the parties suggest otherwise, that's how -- we will do as we've done in the past. I will

ask Ms. Simpson to give me her report findings.

When you're speaking, I will ask that you state your name for the record. I can see you. I can hear you. This is a public hearing. Persons may be participating on the call -- I say "participating." They may be listening. And so there won't be any confusion as to who is speaking at any given time, I'll ask you to, you know, state your name for the purposes of making sure that those who might be on the line will know who's speaking.

So, Ms. Simpson, thank you-all for the work that you have done. I do realize since June, I guess -- I guess -- no, no, since even before June, you've not had the ability to come onto the premises to do what might be necessary to do, and I will get you to explain, if you will, any shortcomings because of your lack of ability to actually come to the facility.

And I want to stress and make sure that the people -or that the record reflects that has nothing to do with you
and your team. It has everything to do with COVID why you
cannot have any personal presence here. No need to jeopardize
you and your team, and no need to jeopardize any of the
attorneys or anyone else.

So I'll start with you, Ms. Simpson, and let you go forward as you deem necessary. I might have some questions about certain things and might interject, but at the end of your presentation, I definitely will give the attorneys the

2.1

opportunity to ask any questions or to do -- make any presentation that they wish to make.

MS. SIMPSON: This is Lisa Simpson. Thank you, Your Honor.

I'm actually going to turn it over to Mr. Parrish fairly quickly because I think the most important issues facing the County and the sheriff have to do with staffing and supervision and the condition of the facility.

But to respond to your question about any limitations by doing these site visits remotely, I'll say a few words. The compliance monitor -- or compliance coordinator and the county staff and the sheriff's staff have been very helpful in getting the documents that we request to us. This site visit was a little more rocky in part because we wanted a lot of the January documents, and January had only just ended by the time we needed the documents, so it was a little trickier, but they have been very helpful in getting documents uploaded that we need to review.

There are limitations, of course. Among others, we can't physically walk around the facility, so we're fairly reliant on people telling us what the condition of the facility is. The same with staffing; we can't see what posts are staffed and what aren't. And some of the files, like the inmate record files, are -- some of them are very voluminous and can't necessarily be fully uploaded. So there's some

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
limitation in reviewing the inmate records. And as each of my
team members speak, they may alert you to other limitations.
And we tried to make a note of it in the report where there
was a limitation in our ability to monitor.
       But we -- and we're just now starting the February site
visit. We had a full day of interviews yesterday, and then
we'll continue on this afternoon. So we may have some updates
from the December report based on the documents that we've
reviewed and the few interviews that we've completed, but
mostly the December report reflects our most recent findings.
       So with that, I think I'll turn it over to Mr. Parrish
so he can talk about the areas within corrections operations.
       THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Simpson.
       Mr. Parrish?
       MR. PARRISH: Good morning, Your Honor.
       THE COURT: Good morning.
       MR. PARRISH: I hope I got it right and unmuted. Okay.
       I'm going to cover three interrelated areas:
                                                     status of
the facilities, staffing, and supervision. And each one is
affected by the other.
       And, you know, with regard to facilities, the Jackson
Detention Center has been closed for over six months due to
plumbing and HVAC issues. The inmates and staff were moved
```

from there to the work center and to the Raymond Detention

Center. And fortunately, with the count being down, they've

```
been able to accommodate that.
 1
 2
            THE COURT: Let me ask a question about that,
 3
    Mr. Parrish. And I apologize for cutting across you.
            When we -- I guess it was in August of 2019 that I
 4
    walked around with the monitors team at the facilities.
 5
 6
    Jackson Detention Center, that's where a lot of -- that's
7
    where the majority of the women were being held; is that
 8
    correct?
           MR. PARRISH: That's correct. And they are now housed
    at the work center.
10
11
            THE COURT: They're now housed at the work center?
12
    there males housed at the work center too?
13
           MR. PARRISH: Yes, there are. There are three housing
    units that house males and one housing unit that handles
14
    females.
15
16
            THE COURT: Okay.
           MR. PARRISH: All right?
17
18
            THE COURT: Okay.
                              Thank you.
19
           MR. PARRISH: All right. There's no estimated date for
20
    reopening of the Jackson Detention Center, but from my
2.1
    perspective that's really a moot point because they don't have
22
    the staff to reopen and run three facilities again. That's
23
    how these things are interrelated.
24
            THE COURT: But let me ask you this, though. I guess
25
    going back to the time that we were there in August, I think I
```

walked away that day with the understanding and the impression that the JDC was the one that was the most efficient, was the one that was, I guess, most efficient. It ran the best. I mean, it seems like they had the most capable people there doing everything that needed to be done.

The only thing -- as I recall, the only hiccup with the Jackson Detention Center was that there was no real area for people to engage in any type of exercise or to go out or to be out. I think that was the only sort of -- to the extent there's something negative about the JDC, that was the only thing. It was run by a young woman I think who was doing an excellent job.

At least I left with that impression on that day that the Jackson Detention Center was the one that was in the best shape and it was the best of the three operations or four operations among the facilities.

MR. PARRISH: Partially correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PARRISH: The oldest jail was built in the 1970s.

It's a linear/intermittent surveillance facility that can't be modified to direct supervision, which is required by the settlement agreement. It's not an efficient facility, but it was a very well-run facility. When I first went through that jail before the settlement agreement, it was a disaster, but they brought in new staff, they turned it around, and it did

run well. The captain that was in charge has since retired.

But there are mechanical and maintenance problems with that facility that are tied to age and design that have caused us to look at recommending that facility be closed from the very beginning. Some of that's going to be covered in master planning when that work is done.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PARRISH: But at any rate, that facility is now closed. There is no estimated date for reopening, and so they're making do with work center, which is now operating at a greater capacity than it did before. It's within capacity, but they're making better utilization of the facility than they did in the past.

And two of the three pods at the Raymond Detention

Center are currently open. Now, at Raymond, Charlie Pod was

under renovation for the second time now for the best part of
a year or more, and it reopened on October the 22nd,

supposedly now under the direct supervision housing mode. But

unfortunately, that's just not the way it's worked out. They

are trying to staff them with an officer inside each housing

unit, but adopting the principles and dynamics of direct

supervision has been a real problem there. That's something

I'll address later on.

Then work on the Bravo Pod, B-Pod, has begun, and the idea was to renovate that and bring it up to the standard of

2.1

Charlie Pod. CML was the firm from Texas that was brought in to work on the doors and the control panel, and the estimate is that they're going to be completed with their work by mid-March. But there are so many other problems to be fixed for which the County has no plan that there's no estimated date for when it will be reopened.

Maintenance is a major problem between the County supposedly providing the service and — the whole maintenance work order system that was put in place under the previous county administrator has kind of collapsed, and it's become dysfunctional, and that's partially because we've had so many personnel changes at the County from the top to the bottom, and the maintenance director retired, was replaced by another one, who is now gone, and I have hopes that as of yesterday they selected somebody else. But getting things repaired has become worse than problematic.

Alpha Pod is still open, but it is totally unsecure due to locks on doors that do not work, and there is no plan to repair this pod. Rather, it's supposed to be closed when Bravo (AUDIO GAP).

THE COURT: Okay. Hold on for one second, Mr. Parrish. You sort of broke off there. You said that there is no plan to repair Pod A?

MR. PARRISH: That's correct.

THE COURT: But it's currently being used?

MR. PARRISH: It is being used until such time as Bravo 1 2 Pod can come back online after CML and the County have repaired it and brought it up to the level of Charlie Pod, 3 4 which was repaired. 5 THE COURT: Okay. The -- what -- the state of disrepair includes the doors not being able to be locked on 6 7 Pod A? MR. PARRISH: In Alpha Pod, that's correct. That's the 8 9 worst of the facility there. 10 THE COURT: How many inmates are in the Alpha Pod? 11 we know? 12 MR. PARRISH: Generally, they've got well over 200 13 people at the Raymond Detention Center, and they're split between Charlie and Alpha, so it's in excess of 100. I can't 14 15 tell you what it is today. THE COURT: I have not compared my notes from the past 16 reports quite yet, but with respect to the locks -- well, is 17 18 there a plan to -- is there a plan to continue to use the 19 Alpha Pod? 20 MR. PARRISH: No, sir. This was done when the 21 stipulated order was put together, and the plan was to repair 22 Charlie first and then to repair Bravo next and then 23 ultimately to repair Alpha only if it's ever put back online. 24 But right now there is no plan to operate that pod once Bravo 25 comes back online.

```
THE COURT: There's no timeframe on when Bravo will be
1
 2
    finished, though; right?
 3
            MR. PARRISH: No, sir.
            THE COURT: Okay. So we're -- so in effect we are
 4
 5
    using -- and when I say "we," the County is using the Alpha
 6
    Pod?
 7
            MR. PARRISH: Oh, it is using it, has always used it,
    but once Bravo comes back online, the plan is to shut it down.
 8
 9
            THE COURT: Right. But there is no target date for
    Bravo to come back online. There's no end date.
10
11
            MR. PARRISH: Not yet, sir, no.
12
            THE COURT: And so while we await the repair of the
13
    Bravo Pod, the Alpha Pod is being used by over 100 inmates,
    and there are no locks -- are there locks on any of the doors?
14
15
            MR. PARRISH: Oh, yes, sir. There are locks in there,
    but the inmates are able to jimmy them and pop out almost at
16
17
    will, even to doors that come out from the housing units, but
18
    certainly from the cell doors.
            THE COURT: Right. The problem that we've been talking
19
20
    about ever since I assumed this case.
2.1
            MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir.
22
            THE COURT: And I quess I assumed this case about two
23
    years ago, I think.
24
           MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir.
            THE COURT: You may proceed, Mr. Parrish.
25
```

MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Your Honor. The next topic is staffing, which has always been a significant problem. The numbers that I got yesterday indicate that staffing is up to about 231 of the about now 281 funded positions. Nine of those 231 are new -- they're not new positions. They used to be contract food service employees, who are now county employees, so that's bumped the number up just a little bit.

Over the past two and a half years, staffing has never exceeded 256. The last report, we were down in the neighborhood of 204 less some people in the academy. So the numbers are up marginally, but when you have the impact of COVID and excessive turnover, it just makes usable people -- getting enough usable people a problem.

There are now 284 authorized positions, of which 281 are funded. If yesterday's figure's correct, we've got 231 that are actually on board. The revised staffing plan calls for 407 people. That was the staffing plan revision that was issued last April.

But Jackson Detention Center is closed; that's about 64 or 65 positions. And the Raymond Detention Center Bravo Pod is closed; that's 45. So you put those together, that's about 110. That means that they really need about 297 positions to operate the portions of the jail system that are open today, and they're in the neighborhood of 230, 231.

The next area deals with supervision, and part of the

2.1

problem is tied back to staffing. Unfortunately, supervisors are called upon to do an awful lot of detention officer work rather than supervisory work because of the vacancies. So, to their credit, they go around and they stand posts and they do work the detention officers should be doing, but it certainly takes away from their ability to actually supervise and make sure that things are done according to the policies and procedures that have been approved.

We're in the neighborhood of 25 to 27 now approved and adopted policies, but getting that out to the officers and having supervisors make sure that they're following it is what has -- it's like the next problem.

I'm going to start off with the direct supervision at the Raymond Detention Center in Charlie Pod. We brought in the National Institute of Corrections to provide training on direct supervision. They did that to orient people. Then Hinds County was to take it upon themselves to train the rest of their staff and be able to open up each pod as it's renovated under direct supervision.

Well, to do that in Charlie Pod means you have to have an officer inside each of the direct supervision housing units. That pulls officers from other places and creates a staffing issue. But unfortunately, the officers working in Charlie Pod at the Raymond Detention Center are used to operating under the old method where they locked inmates down

and were able to walk away from it, or left the door closed so they couldn't come out of the housing unit. And they've been doing the same thing in Charlie Pod, which is not direct supervision. That's not taking control of the place. And it's actually counterproductive.

So I've been working closely with Jail Administrator

Fielder to try and develop some interim guidelines for them

until a proper policy can be developed. And hopefully we'll

be able to get that out to them so they have some direction on

when can I lock an inmate down in his cell? Where are inmates

fed? It's supposed to be in the day room, not in their cells

like they often did before.

It's just a whole cultural change for them, and it's been very difficult. It's been easier to adopt at the work center, which has a dormitory-style operation and was set up that way from the time the building opened up back in early 2000s. And we see that officers are not able to be where they need to be and supervisors, therefore, are filling in for them by -- for instance, in Charlie 4, which is a lock-down area, a significant number of fires set by inmates. That's not what you expect when you have a properly controlled lock-down area.

And all these things are linked to supervision, to lack of staff, and to issues with the facility. Hopefully we were looking at, when Charlie opened up, that the issues with the facility would help alleviate some of these other problems.

2.1

They have to a certain degree, but the level of supervision is still inadequate, inconsistent, and the staffing issues make everything worse. So they're -- the three issues are interrelated.

The encouraging thing is that we finally got Charlie online. I have hopes yet that four months later we'll finally be able to start implementing direct supervision. It should have started in October when it opened up. Unfortunately, that just was not the case.

And that's basically where we stand right now, sir.

THE COURT: With respect to -- with respect to supervision, I'm looking at the executive summary that has been prepared by you-all. Got a couple of questions about supervision.

The executive summary indicates that all the supervisors have been trained on the use-of-force policy.

Now, are those supervisors then in turn responsible for making sure that every other employee is trained in the use-of-force policy? Because I see the executive summary sort of hones in on the fact that the supervisors themselves have been trained on the use-of-force policy, but I'm not sure if it indicates, well, what about the regular COs there and others there at the facility?

MR. PARRISH: The training bureau is providing that training as people come in through the academy. I can't say

that every officer has received this training yet, but they gave priority to that. I'll be having a meeting later this week with the commanders in training to review the specifics of that. They gave me a preliminary report, but I can't say that everybody has had that yet.

But getting the training and then implementing it, overcoming years of history of doing things differently, is the problem to be overcome in all of this. So at least we have it documented now as to what's required, and hopefully through review of specific incidents through having review by CID and IAD, we can make sure that they develop some consistency in applying use-of-force standards.

THE COURT: Okay. The jail administrator, I guess since I've been involved, that position I guess has been filled by -- it was -- I think when I got first involved, Mary Rushing was jail administrator at RDC, and I think the report now reflects that there is a different jail administrator and that that person I believe, according to you, Mr. Parrish, meets all of the qualifications necessary to be the jail administrator?

MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir. He has the education and experience and supervisory experience. That's something we didn't have before. We had a lot of experience but didn't have the requisite education level.

THE COURT: Okay. And under the jail administrator,

there is an assistant jail administrator. The report reflects that that person does not meet the education qualifications that you would expect; is that correct?

MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir. Just going by what the requirements call for for the position, he didn't meet it.

THE COURT: Okay. Did the County give you any particular reason why or what steps that might be taken to make sure that that person or that someone else might be necessary to -- well, what kind of inquiry was -- did you make with respect to that, I guess?

MR. PARRISH: Well, all we can do is really point it out. They've got to look at what experience qualifications you have and compare them against what else is available out there, and they opted for experience as opposed to trying to zero in just on education. You know, sometimes you find the education but you don't have the experience to go with it. So they didn't have, apparently, both requisites fulfilled in a candidate and opted for experience.

THE COURT: Okay. And I think the report shows that the third person necessarily in hierarchy, I guess, at the facility would be -- is a captain, and I think there you indicated that the captain did not meet the requisite supervisory experience. I think -- I think that's in the report.

MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir, he had a great deal of

2.1

experience, but it just wasn't necessarily in a supervisory position for the requisite amount of time. It was close but didn't quite make it, but had a great deal of experience.

THE COURT: Now, and then also with respect to staffing supervision, whatnot, it also -- you know, as the parties know, we've had rounds of trying to meet whether the County might be in full compliance, substantial compliance with respect to any of these things, and I do have some questions about, again, staffing and supervision, the policies and procedures, because I think -- I think the executive summary in the report indicates that substantial -- obviously we want full compliance. That's our goal, I think. Full compliance. And if we can't get full compliance, we want substantial compliance.

And I think I read where there's not even substantial compliance on some of the areas in particular. And part of that -- the substantial compliance cannot be reached, I think, if I recall reading the summary correctly, because you don't have the policies and procedures in place in all of the necessary areas, and this is something that we've been talking about since day one that I've been involved in it.

I think the monitors went out -- well, I think either the monitors went out and got somebody to assist in that regard. I know DOJ was looking at it. The policies and procedures' shortcomings, the sputtering that's going on with

trying to get them all done, in my mind -- and, please, I'm going to give the parties an opportunity to tell me, Judge, no, no, you're wrong, but in my mind is just taking way too long to get some written words on policies and procedures. It's just way too long. It should not take two full years to have the policies and procedures in place. And, again, I'm going to hear from the parties in that regard, but -- and find out what the holdup is and why that just cannot be done.

MS. SIMPSON: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. SIMPSON: This is Lisa Simpson. May I speak to that for a minute? I wanted to give you more precise information as to where we're at on the policies and procedures, and I say "we" because I've been working on them as well.

There's a list of needed policies that is 93 needed policies. Forty-eight of those are identified as priority policies. Of those 48 priority policies, 23 have been approved and adopted as well as four nonpriority policies. So that's 27 policies that have been approved and adopted. Two additional policies are currently under review by the Department of Justice. So you're right, it's been a slow process, and I can speak to that to some extent.

It was slow to get started. I think the sheriff's office and the County looked at different approaches for

getting the policies and procedures completed, and I don't recall how long a period of time that was where it really just didn't get much traction at all.

My team -- actually, Mr. Parrish -- contacted the

National Institute of Corrections to see -- initially to see

if they had an expert in the area of records that could assist

Hinds County in working on their inmate records and the record

system. She turned out to be a very knowledgeable, very

helpful person. NIC could not provide her. I think that had

something to do with the change of administration at that time

and the loss of funding by the NIC. So we recommended that

the County contact with her directly. That apparently was

cumbersome, and so we brought her on to our team.

And I have to apologize. We're having some work done on the house, so if you hear -- (AUDIO GAP) appear to be on the roof right now.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SIMPSON: The -- the -- sorry. They're drilling or something.

The -- so she came on to our team, but the approach that she has taken, which I think is a good approach, but it is a more time-consuming approach, is to work with a committee within Hinds County and have them develop the policies along with her guidance. I think that makes them tailored to Hinds County operations and also is sort of a training mechanism in

the process.

2.1

That happened, moved along fairly well. In the last, I would say, six months, there has not been as much engagement by the Hinds County people. And speaking with Ms. Albert in the last several weeks, that appears to have been remedied. So there should be more progress now, but we did have a period of time where it was difficult getting the policy group to really engage in that process. So I agree it's been slower than it should be, but we're hopeful that we'll now get a little more progress speeding up.

So that's where the policies are, and I would say, however, that with the policies that have been adopted, we don't always see that they're really being implemented, that, you know, there's certain requirements with respect to, oh, classification committees and things of that sort that really don't seem to be being implemented according to the policies. So I think there's still a bit of a disconnect even with policies that have been adopted.

THE COURT: So you're telling me you-all are working on establishing -- using up all this time drafting policies and procedures that would make things work more efficiently and work things according to the standards, but you're drafting -- but they're drafting up the policies and basically relegating them to the dustbin and not implementing them?

MS. SIMPSON: It does appear that they are not fully

implemented. Some are. Some reflect what they've done in the past. I think -- as Mr. Parrish mentioned, I think it's been very difficult for -- to make changes in how the operations are run, and so there's a tendency to just do what they've always done even after a new policy has been adopted that directs some other type of action.

And just as an example, administrative segregation is used extensively at Hinds County, and people stay in segregation for fairly long periods of time. There's actually supposed to be a review under the newly adopted policies, a review of people in administrative segregation by the classification committee every seven days to see if they can be returned to general population. And as near as we can tell, that review doesn't take place and, in fact, classification doesn't always even know why somebody is in administrative segregation.

So that's just one example. There are others. There's supposed to be an audit of grievances. I think the new quality assurance officer is looking at getting that going, but that's something that's in the policies but not done. So there's a number of examples like that. I think Mr. Parrish has some concerns that use of force is not consistent with the policy.

So, yes, even when they're adopted, they're not necessarily fully implemented, and that's an issue that we

continue to look at.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Parrish, what are the shortcomings on the use-of-force type of things that you think are shortcomings? I mean, in my mind that's something easy for me to see. So what sort of shortcomings are we having on the use-of-force policy?

MR. PARRISH: Your Honor, I'll give you an example. On the street certain things are acceptable because if you're not able to pop somebody, they can escape, run down the road, and get away. Inside a correctional facility, a jail or a prison, the same standards do not apply, and you have time and the ability to call for backup and you've got a secure wall that keeps the inmate there.

So with regard to the use of, for instance, OC spray or foam to try and control somebody in a jail setting it's inappropriate to use it to coerce an inmate to do something, to tell them go into that cell and he doesn't go. Go into that cell or I'm going to spray you. He doesn't go. So you spray him with OC. That's an inappropriate use of force. OC and other less lethal weapons are designed for protection. It's entirely appropriate to use it to break up a fight between inmates where they're hurting each other and you can't get into the middle of it. No problem.

It's inappropriate to tell somebody to do something and they refuse to cooperate to then coerce them into doing it by

2.1

spraying them. Unfortunately, that still happens a lot in the jail system, and that's something that has to be overcome through training. They're used to being able to do it that way. You can't do it that way. The policy says very specifically that it cannot be used to coerce somebody or to force them to do something that you tell them unless it's to protect yourself.

If they're coming at you, throwing blows at you, doing something like that, by all means, then it's a defensive tool and it's appropriate to use. But that educational process is a difficult one because it's ingrained in them that if he doesn't do what I say, I can spray him or I can shoot the less-than-lethal shotgun, and that's inappropriate. That's one of those training issues that's going to have to be overcome.

THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Parrish: How do you know that is an issue? Is it because maybe they are documenting it and you see it from the file, or through your monitoring you've talked to inmates or others who have -- I'm just trying to find out -- you say that OC is used quite a bit in various capacities there or utilized quite often, I think might have been the word that you used. But how do we know that? Is it because it's in some sort of document that the monitors have seen?

MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir. It's from reviewing the

incident reports --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. PARRISH: -- the use-of-force reports, the criminal investigative reports subsequently, and the internal affairs investigative reports subsequently, and that's where we draw that information from. It's by their own documentation as to what happened.

THE COURT: Does that documentation show what, if anything -- what discipline, if any, persons who violate the policy, what discipline, if any, they receive?

MR. PARRISH: No, sir. Because nobody is found guilty of violating the policy, even by CID or IAD, in spite of what the policy says. They're all exonerated without exception.

And that's one of the training things that we're going to go through with CID and IAD to have them walk us through cases during this hearing or during this week to please explain to us, this is what the report says; why do you find it this way or that way? And maybe that will help resolve the issue.

THE COURT: You indicated with respect to staffing,

Mr. Parrish, that you still believe that they're understaffed,

and I note that I'm looking again at the report, and I do

appreciate the chart, Ms. Simpson, that you developed to help

keep track of when things are done, and it's very helpful, but

I note that there's a -- at one time the County was trying to

get a recruitment and retention plan adopted.

The first thing they had to do was get a recruitment officer in place, and I think that was done at or near the time of our -- the last status conference we had. I believe they got a retention officer in place. Is that person still in place?

MR. PARRISH: No, sir. Unfortunately, he was transferred to detention afterwards and then resigned, so they're looking for a replacement at the present time.

THE COURT: And so they never -- so they don't have a retention officer, and the person over recruitment, that person was going to be designated or responsible for, again, trying to hire these additional COs and others that were needed within the facilities; right?

MR. PARRISH: Yes, sir. The recruiting officer was part of the group that we talked to during our last remote site visit, and we were scheduled to talk to him again along with the background investigator, but unfortunately, yesterday we learned that he has since resigned.

THE COURT: The County will be able to answer this question, but have they discussed with you, Mr. Parrish, what plan they have? I know when we met in June and even before then, you know, there were talks about trying to hire additional COs and taking every effort necessary, radio advertising, I think, and I even heard some myself. Haven't heard it in a while, I don't think. But they are -- but I

1 assume -- have you and the County discussed what are they 2 doing to try to meet the goals that you say that they're 3 needed for these facilities to be sufficiently staffed? MR. PARRISH: Your Honor, we (AUDIO GAP) directly with 4 5 the County on that issue. The sheriff's office has put 6 together a plan for, like, a career development ladder for 7 detention officers to increase their salary from the neighborhood of 27,000 to about 30,000 and to have step 8 9 increases per year after that. That went to the County, but 10 our understanding is that nothing has been actually approved 11 and implemented yet. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Parrish. 13 MR. PARRISH: Thank you. 14 THE COURT: Thank you so much. 15 Ms. Simpson, I'll return it to you to tell -- let you engineer this train. 16 17 MS. SIMPSON: Okay. And I do have some things to add, 18 but I think I'll have Jim Moeser speak next in the hopes that the people on the roof will have moved elsewhere by the time I 19 20 need to speak. 2.1 And with respect to the juveniles being charged as an adult, there's been sort of an issue that's become a concern, 22 23 and that is that the number of JCAs, as they're referred to, 24 has been growing, and the Henley-Young facility has a cap, and

so the County has been concerned about what alternatives there

25

```
1
    are for the JCAs.
            So in addition to having Mr. Moeser talk about the
 2
 3
    conditions and compliance with the settlement agreement, I'd
    like to have him sort of explain what that issue is. And
 4
 5
    obviously you'll need to hear more from the County and the
 6
    sheriff's office with respect to where that stands.
 7
            So I'll turn it over to Mr. Moeser now.
 8
            THE COURT: Thank you.
 9
           MR. CHENG: Your Honor, this is Christopher Cheng.
            THE COURT: Yes.
10
11
            MR. CHENG: If I could interrupt just for a moment.
12
    did want to point out that the counsel for interested parties,
    the Southern Poverty Law Center, have been present in this
13
    hearing from the beginning. I see Leslie Faith Jones up on my
14
15
    screen, at least. I did want to mention they are here today.
16
            THE COURT: Thank you, because I don't see that.
17
            Anyone else with you, Ms. Jones? Maybe you can't --
18
    maybe she can't --
19
           MS. JONES: Yes, sir. Good morning.
20
            THE COURT:
                       I'm sorry?
21
            MS. JONES: Good morning, Judge Reeves. Good morning.
22
    Yes, sir. I am here with Miranda Bolef, also from our office.
23
            THE COURT: Could you spell the last name?
24
           MS. JONES:
                       Yes, sir. B-o-l-e-f.
25
            THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Jones. And the interested
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

parties are particularly interested in the Henley-Young matter; is that right? For the most part; right? MS. JONES: Yes, sir. Thank you, Judge Reeves. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Moeser, thank you. MR. MOESER: Thank you, Your Honor. Good morning to everyone. So my name is Jim Moeser, M-o-e-s-e-r, and I have been focusing, as Lisa said, on the youth charged as adults located at Henley-Young. Currently there are, I think, 22 youth that fit that category, and I'll cover kind of a range of things from personnel to physical plant, some programming and some population issues that start to hit on the concerns that Ms. Simpson mentioned about location, where they stay. Just -- personnel, just from the prior report, even as that was being written, changes were occurring. The executive director that had started in May left at the end of November. The mental health treatment coordinator that started in, well, actually, I think also early November left near the end of November as well. So those are two key vacancies. So there's again an acting executive director, Mr. Burnside, who has filled that role and close to that role a number of occasions over the past years. I think since I've been involved in fall of 2016, I think it's about -- I would say most -- probably the majority of time has been a vacant executive director position.

```
THE COURT: The -- I'm sorry, Mr. Moeser. At one time,
 1
 2
    I guess, since I've been involved, they did have an executive
 3
    director --
 4
           MR. MOESER: Correct.
 5
            THE COURT: -- or somebody on staff.
            MR. MOESER: Yeah. Mr. McDaniels, when I started, was
 6
7
    involved. He went on leave at the time he ran for a court
 8
    position, for a judicial position, so he was gone for a period
 9
    of time on leave, and then he was elected, and then it took
    another four or five months to hire his replacement. That
10
11
    person I think began at the start of May and left at the end
12
    of November. So it's been pretty significant. Just so you're
    aware that that executive director position has continued to
13
    be in flux really the whole time that we've been involved.
14
15
            THE COURT: Was that -- I'm sorry. Was that the
    position -- did Mr. Fernandez Frazier hold that position at
16
    one time?
17
18
           MR. MOESER: Oh, that's correct.
19
            THE COURT: I'm sorry?
20
           MR. MOESER: Mr. Frazier was -- your memory is better
2.1
    than mine. Yes. Mr. Frazier was in there for a period of
22
    time as well. So really there have been three people since
23
    I've been involved as well as big gaps of time when there's
24
    not been someone in that role. Right.
25
            THE COURT: Okay. And currently right now that role is
```

being filled by Mr. Burnside on an interim basis?

MR. MOESER: Correct. Correct. The mental health treatment coordinator, which is a position that we've been advocating for, as you know, for quite a while was filled originally by a psychologist for a period of time. She left.

Ms. Walker was hired as a -- in that position in early

November, I believe, last year and left in about the third week of November. So, again, that position has been largely vacant for significant periods of time. And both of those are pretty key positions. So those are a concern.

I would say, again, Mr. Burnside and Mr. Dorsey have been through this a number of times at Henley-Young and continue to try and carry the load, but it is a challenge.

They have hired a new training and development coordinator, which is helpful. There has been always a position for training officer being filled by someone who's on leave, on military duty, for most of the time I've been involved. They've had other people temporarily filling that role.

Mr. Harrington I think created -- I think wisely sort of realigned that position to be sort of a training and development coordinator, and someone has been brought on board who seems to have or at least purported to have really good experience and will be able to develop sort of a training curriculum that goes beyond the basics. That's been the

constant concern, that due to staff turnover and training limitations, staff were getting sort of basic training and not much beyond that. But hopefully this person can help put together a curriculum and development structure so that as people progress in their experience they will also be able to get more training.

There's also brought on board in the fall a program -sort of a program coordinator who was charged with developing
additional life skill, social skill, cognitive behavioral
interventions to work with kids to fill in some of the time on
the units that otherwise was left for playing cards, and
things around decision-making and anger management and things
like that that she has been working on and developing that
as -- I'll talk a little bit more about that when I get to
programming in particular.

And, you know, in the December report, you'll notice significant concerns about the vacancies in the youth care professional position. That has been alleviated somewhat but still remains an issue. I think, according to Mr. Burnside, as of yesterday, there were still eight or nine vacancies, which is not — which is more than there had been in prior years but less than the 15 vacancies that we found when we were there last time, or talked (AUDIO GAP).

But that raises a significant challenge to filling -- you know, covering shifts, having the staff in the facility to

be able to move youth around the facility appropriately, to get them to visitation -- or to get them for phone calls, for other safety concerns, if they have youth that needs one-on-one supervision, et cetera.

They still remain pretty short staffed and still significant amounts of turnover, as well as the vast majority of youth care professionals have second jobs because the pay is so poor that it makes it difficult for training. They can't fill extra shifts. Apparently the County doesn't allow or provide overtime compensation, A, so I think you'll see in the last report, I alluded to that, you know, Mr. Burnside and those folks were really just struggling just to get people to fill slots that were needed, and I think that's still somewhat of an issue, although they've brought in some new people to begin training.

So personnel -- similar to Mr. Parrish, these things are interrelated. Personnel is a significant issue, and I don't see Henley-Young being able to progress in some of the other areas until that's stabilized either through an increase in pay or other means to recruit and retain line staff to stay there for periods of time where they can become experienced and get more training.

They are also facing, both on the adult and youth side, apparently a new recruitment from the state Department of Corrections in which someone with even less experience and

less education than Henley-Young requires can make 8 to \$10,000 a year more being hired by the State. They're expecting -- Mr. Burnside's concerned about staff leaving him as that recruitment goes forward. So that remains a significant issue.

Physical plant. The additional portable classroom space has been added but not yet utilized. It is furnished. I think the necessary electronics and cameras I think are installed, but they have not been used yet and integrated into the program, partly due to -- largely due to lack of staffing and teaching staff. The intent would have been to -- and continues to be to be able to use those as classrooms, which would require additional teachers from Jackson public schools and will require staff -- enough staff in the facility to make sure they can cover additional spaces, although some of that can be accommodated by how you move kids around.

But at least the physical part is there; however, the security fencing around those units has not been completed. Also can't use them for that reason. So they're technically, I guess, outside -- in the recreation yard fence, they are outside that space, so they need additional fencing, which I understand has been bid -- I think bids -- and someone from the County may know. I think bids may have been received, but there's -- I'm not sure of any timetable for actual completion.

The door locking/unlocking system has broken down.

It's an old system, not modern, and not uncommon that those things eventually wear out. All the doors -- interior doors have to be opened and locked manually. That's not ideal. It slows things down in terms of movement through the facility. It also means staff are carrying keys. Kids sometimes then know that staff have keys that can open certain doors. They have not had any incidents where staff have been attacked to get keys, but there are always ongoing concerns. But it's not the ideal.

That's a fairly expensive proposition. There have been some potential bidders on the site recently, but, again, I don't have a timetable on when something might be done. The cameras do work so they can do observation from a central area, but they can't control any movement or doors.

The population -- well, let me talk about programming first. Programming continues to be a concern. Education continues to be split. There are -- because of -- and this is interrelated to staffing as well as behavioral issues with youth. Not all the kids are getting school all the time. There are kids, for example, today -- at least or yesterday when we asked, half the youth are -- half of the youth charged as adults are doing work on their unit in packets that the teachers prepare that are given to them, and staff that are on the unit can help them, but having observed that in a prior

```
1
    visit, it's pretty -- it's marginal -- it's marginal, if
    helpful at all, and I can't -- it's one of the limitations of
 2
    not being on-site to be able to really see what's actually
 3
    happening.
 4
            But I think there are extended periods of time where
 5
    youth are not really getting educational services. The
 6
7
    teachers are there but are only seeing half the kids at a
 8
    time, and even what was a marginal school program, in my
 9
    opinion, is even more so problematic now. And that has not
10
    changed, and, again, not being able to be there on-site, I
11
    have a lot of concerns about how that's being done.
12
            Some of the other program- -- go ahead.
13
            THE COURT: Let me ask you this, Mr. Moeser: What's
    the age of the youngest child there?
14
15
            MR. MOESER: Let me see if I can get that. Fourteen,
    looks like. Looks like 14. There are -- of the 22 youth in
16
17
    that category, ten of them are 17, and then, you know, 15 and
18
    16. So 14 is youngest I see right now.
            THE COURT: And all of these -- all of these children,
19
20
    like the people at RDC, are awaiting trial; right?
21
            MR. MOESER: Yes. I'm told that -- although the
22
    document they gave me doesn't reflect this, I'm told verbally,
23
    and I want to try and confirm that before the week is out,
24
    that the vast majority of the 22 youth charged as adults have
25
    been indicted. You know, someone said 21 of the 22. I'm not
```

sure that's -- I can't confirm that, but there are four youth that have been there over a year, and so length of stay continues to be an issue for the youth and the --

THE COURT: And as a part of what you're doing, that is information that I would like to know: how long they are there pre-indictment and post-indictment.

MR. MOESER: Okay.

THE COURT: And it's concerning to me that, again, like, a 14-year old obviously has been accused of -- I assume all of them have been accused of, I guess, murder or rape, I guess. I mean, not just any felony. I guess it's murder and rape, and I guess the -- they've been certified as adults and the state court judges have found or determined that there are no conditions that they can place on these kids to be released from jail, you know, any kind of bond, any type of anything they -- I guess the judges have determined that the best place for that individual is the Henley-Young facility.

MR. MOESER: I think that's generally right, Your

Honor. The charges often are -- there's -- strong-arm robbery
is a common one, armed robbery, some -- I think a couple
homicide cases. These are directly filed as adults. The
majority of youth do not have a bond available. The other
ones obviously are pretty high. So they are stuck.

And I'm -- it's actually a good lead-in to one of the other issues with the population that as the length of stay

has increased -- and this -- you will recall that's been an issue all along. Judge McDaniels had implemented what's called the Minors Diversion Docket, which was trying to, through an arrangement with the chief judge, do what he called Minors Diversion Docket, which was within 90 days bringing the parties together and seeing what direction the case was going.

He did get that started, and back in the late spring and early summer, when he was still on that assignment, there were a number of hearings that were being held. He did release some youth. He did return, I think, one or more youth back to the youth court. So there was some fairly quick review.

That ceased at the time he was transferred to criminal court. He sent a memo suggesting that that diversion docket be continued. It wasn't. The County now has been exploring with the judges and working with the judges and the district attorney to develop some process to expedite these youthful cases. That has not been resolved as far as I can tell or kicked in in any significant way, either in terms of indictment or, you know, getting these cases to trial.

I think the district attorney -- it sounds like the district attorney is currently on board with moving them sooner, and the judges hopefully are going to be on board and there's going to be some expediting of these cases that will have an effect, but we don't know yet. And Mr. Gaylor can --

2.1

THE COURT: But we have nobody from the District Attorney's Office present today; right?

MR. MOESER: I believe that's correct.

THE COURT: So that's been a shortcoming all along, under the past administration and now it looks like this administration. I understand this suit is against Hinds

County, and it doesn't say the State of Mississippi, which is the office that the district attorney represents. I know it's a state office, but the district attorney is a necessary cog in this wheel because they're part of the Criminal Justice

Coordinating Committee, if nothing else.

But I don't have anybody here from that office to help me see why is it that, you know, we have these kids and the people at RDC -- because we've talked about this before, that people over in RDC for 3, 4, 5, 600 days before getting a trial or having a case disposed of in some way.

All right. Let me ask you. I'm looking at your report. Again, this is the executive summary. You say -- and this is a related point, Mr. Moeser -- concerns remain related to the extended length of stay for JCA youth particularly given the absence of a judge overseeing the Minors Diversion Docket initiated by Judge McDaniels.

I realize Judge McDaniels now does something else as the youth court judge. I think he's over the criminal docket, I think. But there is another youth court judge now.

MR. MOESER: Correct.

THE COURT: Judge Hicks. Now, has she continued that process? Is she -- what is it -- to your knowledge, what is it that she's doing as youth court judge now?

MR. MOESER: Right. So to the best of my knowledge, in that she started her term relatively shortly before, I think, our last calls and visit, has not picked up that docket in any way. There's been no -- despite, well, Judge McDaniels laying out that process, has not been picked up by her or initiated or authorized by Judge -- I don't know if Judge Green is still the presiding chief judge or not, but -- so no one has picked up that process.

So she is doing solely youth court cases, child welfare cases, juvenile court cases, and that's -- she's not involved at all at this point with these youth charged as adults.

THE COURT: Who's -- is it -- does anyone know who's in -- I would have assumed that that was going to fall up under the judge who was assigned to the youth court. That's how it's been in the past.

MR. MOESER: And Mr. Gaylor may be able to say more. I mean, I think that was -- that process was a unique creation of Judge McDaniels given his experience at Henley-Young and his interest in that population and moving those cases forward. He saw the impact of them lingering at Henley-Young, and so he took it upon himself to work with Judge Green and

some others to develop that Minors Diversion Docket, but that was the first time it's been implemented in any way. And I think it was a very creative and potentially productive solution to some of the length-of-stay issues.

But it was not technically a youth -- he was doing it as a -- somehow he was given this extra docket assigned by Judge Green, so it was a little bit off-line in the normal process is my understanding.

MR. GAYLOR: Your Honor, if I can --

THE COURT: Hold on, Mr. Gaylor. And, Mr. Gaylor, you can correct me. It's my understanding that we have three youth court judges -- three county court judges, excuse me. One judge does primarily criminal work, the criminal docket. That is now Judge McDaniels. One judge does the civil docket. That's now Judge Stokes. And then there's a judge to the youth court. In the past that position -- even before Mr. McDaniels had it as a youth court position, that was -- Judge Skinner was housed over there in Henley-Young, and he did it.

So it has always -- over the last several years or maybe even decades, the County has divided it up in this particular way with respect to -- going back to Judge -- going back to Judge Henley days, who the detention center is named in part after, Chet Henley. I mean, you know, so these have been divided -- these responsibilities have been divided

between these county court judges. Again, though, I'll hear from Mr. Gaylor, because -- because if I am incorrect in how I think it is, I certainly need to be corrected.

MR. GAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. If I may interject, I can perhaps bring a little clarity to the situation.

Again, I also have board president Credell Calhoun, who has been in my office since almost the beginning of the call, since he joined us, so I just wanted to make you aware that the board president is on the call as well.

Now, with regard to the administration of the docket, the youth court judge is Judge Hicks. She was assigned that by the chief county court judge, Judge Stokes. The chief circuit court judge, Judge Green, had assigned -- or had attempted to assign as a special circuit judge Judge McDaniels for the administration of the JCAs. It has been brought to my attention by Judge Green that most of those JCAs, perhaps 21 of the 23, have been indicted. So now all of those cases belong to the judges -- the circuit court judges who have those cases, and 15 of those cases actually are with Judge Green.

So the Minor Diversion Docket that you're speaking of probably would have been -- and, again, I'm not completely familiar because I'm somewhat newer to it as well, but the Minor Diversion Docket you're speaking of primarily would have been taking place with people pre-indictment.

```
But nevertheless, that being said, Judge Green informed
 1
    me that most of those cases now reside with -- the vast
 2
 3
    majority of those cases reside with the circuit judges that
    have those cases. And so what has been taking place now is
 4
    conversations between the circuit court and the District
 5
    Attorney's Office to figure out a way to process those cases
 6
7
    for the JCAs now.
           Most of those JCAs do have a bond, some of which are as
 8
 9
    low as $15,000. But several of those -- a few of those cases
10
    do have no bonds because of the heinous nature of the crime
11
    and other factors, I imagine. So that is what's taking place
12
    right now, Your Honor.
13
            THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Gaylor.
14
           MS. SIMPSON: Your Honor?
15
            THE COURT: Ms. Simpson?
           MS. SIMPSON: Could I mention that the district
16
    attorney, Jody Owens, has joined the call?
17
18
                              Thank you. I see Mr. Owens. Okay.
            THE COURT: Okay.
            And, Mr. Owens, you might chime in to explain some
19
20
    things at some point in time.
2.1
            But, Mr. Moeser, I'll go back to you. You can continue
22
    where you left off.
23
            MR. MOESER: Sure. Thank you, Your Honor.
                                                       I think
24
    that's probably a good way to seque into the concerns that
25
    Ms. Simpson alluded to. If the population of youth charged as
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
adults continues to grow -- and I'll just mention to you that,
again, about ten of those kids currently there will turn 18
this calendar year, and most of the youth that have left that
facility under that youth charged as adult are aging out
versus actually getting to court and getting to sentencing or
getting to conviction, so I think the effort to the extent --
and Mr. Owens could talk more about that.
       If they are indicting faster, that's good, and Mr. --
Judge McDaniels had been correct -- Attorney Gaylor was
correct that he was hearing cases that had not been indicted
yet, which was very slow to happen and in some cases months
and months before even being indicted, so if in fact most of
the youth are indicted, that's good news. It doesn't match
the document I have, but I can straighten that out later.
       THE COURT: When you say "aging out," is that 18 or 21?
       MR. MOESER: They'll turn 18 and be transferred to
Raymond.
       THE COURT:
                  Okay. At 18?
       MR. MOESER: Correct. Correct.
       THE COURT:
                   Thank you.
       MR. MOESER: Yeah. But anyway, so the concern is
from -- the County's concern that's been raised is if that
population continues to rise, either because we can't get a
```

handle on moving these -- expediting these cases and getting

them to disposition in some way and given potential -- some

concerns about potential rise in crime, if that population continues to increase, they will take over a significant -they already have a significant part of Henley-Young, but with a population cap of 32, Mr. Gaylor has explained that Judge Hicks is concerned about not having Henley available for youth court kids.

Ironically, as of today, I think there are no youth court kids at Henley-Young. That number has remained very low over the past year or more, but there are concerns about the growing number of youth charged as adults at Henley-Young. So I think it's important to everyone's benefit to be able to maintain Henley-Young as a viable facility that cases keep moving forward as best they can.

So these things -- so, yes, it's intertwined with how fast they're moving through the system and is raising some concern on the part of the County as to the long-term viability of Henley-Young as the place for youth charged as adults or other youth, for that matter.

So let me move on -- so let me get to -- oh, I'll just say there has been and I think you'll see in the report of December reference to that Henley-Young is a safe and stable environment. I think that's -- I would say I'm less confident of that this time than I was back then.

There has been a, I would say, notable increase in the number of incidents that include fights between youth, two

suicide attempts, a handful of youth that are really sort of involved in a bunch of stuff that they are struggling to get a handle on. I think some of it is related to the lack of staff and limited experience of staff. I continue to suggest that some of it's related to the physical plant, challenges with programming.

The youth are on their living units for significant periods of time with limited or marginal programming, and I don't remember if I've said this in your court, Your Honor, but in the youth world we say "if you don't plan activities for them, they will plan activities for you." So the more we can keep them programmed and better supervised, the less likely those incidents will be occurring.

I think there are also some concerns that some of those youth have significant mental health issues that they are continuing to work to address, but I think we really need to see to what extent they're able to manage some of the youth there. I think they are. I think they're capable of doing it, but they need a stable staff, they need a better physical plant, and they need to have that support to do that kind of programming that is needed.

And I think I'll just mention the -- it's a little difficult -- I think Ms. Simpson alluded to the value of being on-site is being able to look through youth records, cross-reference things, talk face-to-face with both staff and

```
That's hard to do from a site -- from a virtual visit,
 1
    youth.
 2
    so there are limitations on what we can -- you know, how
    confident I am of some of the things, but I echo Ms. Simpson's
 3
    notes that they did provide quite a bit of documentation, and
 4
    that's the bulk of what we've been able to look through and
 5
    work from. And I'll leave it there.
 6
 7
            THE COURT: Candice, how are you doing?
 8
            THE REPORTER: I'm okay, Judge.
 9
            THE COURT: Okay. All right.
            Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moeser. I'll expect the County
10
11
    to tell me -- they can put a pin in, you know, when they
12
    anticipate getting a permanent -- again, something other than
    an interim executive director on board and a treatment
13
    coordinator for the kids over there.
14
15
            But, Ms. Simpson, you can call your next person.
            MS. SIMPSON: Okay. I'll have Dr. Dudley speak to the
16
17
    mental health and medical issues, and then I'll wrap up with
18
    some of the additional areas that we look at.
19
            Dr. Dudley?
20
            THE COURT: Okay. I note that Mr. Synarus Green is
2.1
    on -- is now on. Is that correct?
22
            MR. GREEN: Yes, sir, Your Honor. I just switched
23
    devices.
24
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
25
           Mr. Dudley, thank you. Dr. Dudley, excuse me.
```

DR. DUDLEY: Good morning, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning.

2.1

DR. DUDLEY: I'll just say that with regard to the virtual visits, the major limitations that I have is that I'm unable to meet with and talk to individuals about whom I might have some concern with regard to their mental health, and I therefore have to rely more on the medical records.

The only problem there is that in the absence of -when we're on-site, I can get into the medical records myself
and do it, but in this kind of virtual setup, I don't have
remote -- direct remote access into the electronic medical
records, and so somebody has to sit there with me, share their
screen, and -- as I go through the records, so it's just a
little bit more cumbersome. So I can see still see the
medical records; it's just a little bit more difficult than
when I was able to do it on my own on-site.

The issues that Mr. Parrish mentioned with regard to the physical plant issues, the staffing issues, supervisory issues, I just wanted to note that those issues do have an impact on the delivery of health and mental health services. There are times when, for example, med pass gets interrupted and can't be completed because of -- in the context of a unit where there's doors that aren't locking, et cetera, and the shortage of staff, there's may be no one to sufficiently accompany the nurses for doing that.

2.1

Similarly, there are times when the mental health staff can't see someone on the unit or complete seg rounds, things like that. So it does have its impact on the delivery of medical and mental health services.

With regard to updates, the long-standing vacant qualified mental health professional position has been filled. That person started this last week, so the good news is that it's filled and the person has started. But the shortage of or the vacancy -- as a matter of fact since we've been here the last time, just one qualified mental health professional trying to address all the mental health needs, and so the difficulties that we've described in the last report essentially remained until last week.

Another update is that there appears to be improved operation around identifying and addressing the needs of those whose mental status deteriorates while in segregation; that mental health staff have found that the classification staff are working much better with them to address the needs of those so identified and assure that their mental health needs can be addressed and some other placement, where indicated, can be identified for them. So that's good news, because in the past when individuals were deteriorating with regard to their mental status while in segregation, it was hard to have those issues addressed.

Another update is that, as I mentioned in the last

2.1

report, I obtained a consultant for the mental health staff at the facility and those in the central office of the contractor to help them with regard to the planning for a mental health unit. That consultant has shared an enormous amount of information with them. There was also a virtual site visit arranged for them to visit one of the best jail mental health units in the country, and the warden and representatives from security and mental health all went on that virtual site visit together.

I sat in on it. They really talked about the planning process, the physical space needs, how they implemented the program, the lessons that they learned from doing that, and the feedback that that was enormously helpful to the security side as well as to the mental health side in moving forward in the planning for a mental health unit not only in the existing facility but in the future.

I mentioned in the last report that the State was beginning to do competency (AUDIO GAP) via telepsychiatry to address the backlog and the difficulty moving people, and that has in fact happened. They were being done at about the rate of one to two a week, and so that that has moved forward.

We don't have access to the findings of those competency evaluations, but at least they have been being done. As best I can tell, there was only one person who was so acutely ill and disorganized that they were unable to be

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
evaluated via telepsychiatry and therefore had to be actually
taken to the state facility for that evaluation, but for the
most part these telepsychiatry competency evaluations have
moved forward.
       MS. SIMPSON: Dr. Dudley, are you finished, or do you
have more?
       DR. DUDLEY: I'm finished.
       MS. SIMPSON: Okay.
       Your Honor, do you want me to wrap up the final areas?
       THE COURT: Yes. Yes. Yes, Ms. Simpson.
       Dr. Dudley, it looks like you've been spared. I don't
have many questions for you, I don't think.
       MS. SIMPSON: So I think the really important areas
have been covered in terms of the facility and the staffing
and the supervision. I look primarily at sort of system
issues and administrative areas, so I'll just run through
those, but I think the major concerns are in the areas I
mentioned.
       I wanted to mention some things that have been very
good milestones. One is that the contractor -- the
consultants that were retained to prepare a master planning
report have in fact completed that report and have made some
recommendations, some recommended options for the County to
consider.
       We've reviewed the report. We have not -- I think our
```

2.1

talk with them is tomorrow, but we had the report to review, and it really is a very good report, I believe. They did an excellent job of sort of assessing what it would take to make the current facilities operational and what the costs would be as well as some options for new facilities.

And I'll mention in that regard you had stated, Your Honor, that the JDC facility seemed to be one of the better-run facilities, which I think we would agree. A big part of the problem and the reason why we recommended a master planning process to begin with is that the staffing and the cost associated with running three facilities is really prohibitive, and so that was the purpose of the master planning process was to figure out which could be retained affordably or should they look at sort of building a new facility that would potentially allow them to close all three facilities.

So that master planning process I think is -- was an important one, and it made some recommendations, some recommended options, that I think will be helpful for the County to consider based on the information -- the wealth of information that's in that report.

And I wanted to -- one of the areas that I look at is grievances, and so in that connection I review grievance responses to see if they're appropriate. I wanted to share with you one of the grievances because, as Mr. Parrish

mentioned, A-Pod is in pretty bad condition, and I think this information from the inmate is sort of -- provides some detail to that. And I'll paraphrase a little bit.

It says, we're housed on a zone where the lights don't work. It's dark. We can't see at all. The doors do not lock at all. It's already dark. The light's out. We can't see, and the doors don't lock at all. The zone is real nasty. The cells are flooded everywhere with little tadpoles and little bugs in the water and the cell welded shut. There's a cell that's welded shut, so we can't clean it up. The top shower is broke. The water is not coming out, but it's running, so the water is foaming up inside the wall. And we still have not received cleaning supplies to clean up what we can.

And we did confirm with staff that the lights in Al have been mostly out for the last month and a half. They function intermittently. The detention officers use flashlights. There are in fact plumbing problems. The roof leaks, so when it rains, there's puddles on the floor. So it -- again, one of the limitations of a remote site visit is that we're not actually on-site to see the conditions, but it does appear from both staff and the inmates that A-Pod needs -- even though it's not going to be used going forward, it needs some work now to be livable.

A couple of good progress areas. The quality assurance officer that was hired, I believe last summer, is really doing

a fine job, a very good job. She's pulling together data from the different departments and not only putting it in a spreadsheet-type report, but she's developed a template for a narrative that would go with that.

She also has put together another spreadsheet that really looks at the reporting requirements of the settlement agreement and who's responsible and when they're supposed to be done so that she can track that and make sure that all of those reports are completed. And not just those required by the settlement agreement but also those that would be required by best practices.

One difficulty for her, though, is that she relies on the underlying data being accurate, and it is not always accurate, and that's a problem that we've had with particularly the incident reports from the beginning that not only are the incident report narratives not always complete, but there are fields that need to be checked off that are not necessarily checked off.

So, for example, I think her November report had five use of force — that there had been five uses of force during the month when in fact if you go through the narrative of the incident reports there actually had been 11 uses of force, ten of which were OC spray. So she's moving in the right direction, but it will be difficult for those reports to be fully useful if the underlying data doesn't get improved.

2.1

I've not talked to the people from records or classification yet, so I don't really have an update from the December report. There's really been very good improvement in the records since -- certainly since we started the monitoring. We see much better consistency with the JMS system, the underlying files, and who's actually in the facility. So that's moving in the right direction.

There's still -- as of the December report, there were still some areas of difficulty where individuals were held longer than they should have been, typically not long periods of time, but just a few areas where the system needs some tweaking still.

Classification has also improved quite a bit since we started monitoring. There were a few glitches there, but the -- for the most part, the classification -- the initial classifications are being done accurately and there's not the same overrides.

As I mentioned earlier, there are quite a few people in administrative segregation. They don't seem to be getting the periodic review that they are supposed to be getting. And so that's an area of concern within classification.

The PREA officer -- PREA coordinator is doing very well. The quality of her reports have really improved, and she's really circling back to ensure that victims are getting the services that they need, so that's been a good area of

2.1

improvement. The one concern is sometimes we see in the incident reports what is a PREA incident that doesn't end up getting referred to the PREA coordinator, and so that training of the officers needs to be focused on. And, of course, training has been an issue under COVID, so hopefully that will gear up a little more once -- once everybody's vaccinated.

There is -- one of the requirements of the stipulated order is that there be hiring somebody -- or retaining somebody to assist with development of a pretrial services program. We spoke with the person that oversees that area, the court liaison, yesterday, and she is applying to a nonprofit to become a learning site for the development of a pretrial program. That application is due at the end of the month, so it -- it's not in the process yet, but that is a step towards compliance in that area that we really hadn't seen before.

So as I mentioned, there are areas of improvement, not just in these few areas that I've talked about, but certainly completing the renovations of C-Pod is a big step, and the quality control officer, PREA, there are areas of improvement.

Reviewing the incident reports, we continue to see operations maybe not changing that much despite these steps that have been taken, and a lot of that goes back to the inability to retain staff and sort of make -- retain staff long enough that the midlevel supervisors are qualified and

```
able to provide better quidance to the line officers, and so
1
 2
     that probably contributes quite a bit to the difficulties in
    bringing operations into -- in line.
 3
            And I believe that's all I have as well.
 4
            THE COURT: Let me -- the Criminal Justice Coordinating
 5
    Committee, it looks like they have not met since maybe last
 6
7
     February. Is that a system that is not working? Is that -- I
 8
     assume they can meet remotely like we're doing now. It would
 9
    not require people to be in the same room, I wouldn't guess.
     Is that a fair assumption?
10
11
            MS. SIMPSON: Mr. Gaylor informed me that they had met
12
     in December, and I believe Ms. Moore mentioned that they had
    met in October.
13
14
            THE COURT: Okay.
15
            MS. SIMPSON: I'll let Mr. Gaylor speak to that.
    looks like he was unmuting there for a minute. Anyway, I
16
17
    understand from Mr. -- okay.
18
            MR. GAYLOR: Right. Correct. We have met at least two
19
     times since the date that you mentioned last February.
20
     Probably three times since then, actually.
2.1
            THE COURT: Okay.
22
            MR. GAYLOR: We had -- but most recently we did have a
23
    meeting of stakeholders, which I believe should be classified
24
     as that type of a coordinating committee, in December, and
    primarily we're just trying to figure out a way to process
25
```

through this bottleneck because, again, I don't believe that we can make the representations in the absence of the pandemic that it is a huge challenge for us to have the processing of trials right now. So we're still working through that.

THE COURT: Well, y'all -- Hinds County's doing a better job of having trials than we are. Hinds County is having trials in civil matters and some criminal matters, so, you know, I don't know -- I don't know how it could be justified to have the civil trials to the extent of the criminals. I mean, you know, that's just my view. I mean, I know some of the judges are having trials, because I read about the verdicts.

MR. GAYLOR: Right. Well, Your Honor, honestly, it has been somewhat haphazard, to say the least, because we were having difficulties finding venues to convene grand juries. We've had to contract with hotels. We've had the assistance from the secretary -- state secretary of Agriculture, I guess, Agriculture secretary, to use the Trademart Center and other agencies' venues.

We've had quite a bit of a problem, and so we do have a significant bottleneck right now, particularly in the criminal arena, but there were only probably two of the four judges that were having court at least on a little bit more of a routine basis than the others, but that has not been normal at all.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm not one who's pushing folk to go to trial. I'm not doing that, I mean, because I have not had a trial here in over a year -- or in about a year myself, so I'm just saying, but I've had no civil trials or criminal trials, and to the extent I expect to have anything, it's going to be criminal trials because those defendants have that higher constitutional right, at least, or definitive constitutional right, unlike persons who are pursuing civil matters.

We're going to be ready to take a break to give my court reporter about a ten-minute break. You can put your -- you know, you can put your -- keep your speaker on mute.

Don't take your Zoom thing to the bathroom with you. Shut that off, and, you know, take it -- go powder your nose.

We're going to take about a ten-minute break.

And I'll tell the County and the sheriff what I'm concerned about here: the notion that Pod A is being used, and Pod A should not be used, from what I heard about the lights being out, the leaking roof, the doors not working, the officers having to use flashlights. I understand it's being used because Pod B is totally incapable of being used, and I don't know how long the County intends to continue doing that.

And I'm going to give the County too the opportunity to address those other things that Ms. Simpson and her team has said, like the substantial time that people are placed in

```
1
     administrative segregation without -- or prolonged
 2
     administrative segregation. It seems like -- there seems to
 3
    be no follow-up. The fact that we have had -- we have been
     talking about these policies and procedures and
 4
 5
     implementing -- well, first of all, drafting them and,
 6
     secondly, implementing them, and now what I've heard today,
 7
     some have been drafted but very few have been implemented.
     it seems to me that what's the use? If you're not going to --
 8
 9
     you know, so I'll be ready to hear from you on those things as
    well as the other things, including the use-of-force policy,
10
11
     the hospitalizations that have occurred, and the
12
     inmate-on-inmate assaults that have occurred.
13
            There are other things. I'm sure Mr. Cheng and others
    will make sure we cover everything, but those are the things
14
15
     that come to the front of my mind right now that deserve and
    need a response from the County, and now that Mr. Owens is on
16
     from the state authorities as well.
17
18
            We're going to take about a ten-minute break and then
19
    we'll start back up.
20
                   (A brief recess was taken.)
2.1
            THE COURT: Are we ready to proceed?
22
            MR. CHENG: Yes, Your Honor.
23
            THE COURT: Okay.
24
            MR. CHENG: The United States is ready.
25
            THE COURT: All right. The County? I don't see
```

```
1
    Mr. Gaylor or Mr. Chambers.
 2
            MR. GAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor, we're still on.
            THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right. Well,
 3
    we'll -- we're back from a recess.
 4
 5
            Obviously the County's doing some things, and I know
    the sheriff is doing other things, and some of which y'all are
 6
7
    doing together. So how do you propose is more efficient to
    proceed? Who has the most answers? Because I have plenty of
 8
 9
    questions. Or at least the monitor's laid out plenty of
    things that are unresolved or questions, so who would like to
10
11
    go first?
12
            I'm very accommodating. I usually give you an
    opportunity. If you want me to just designate one of you to
13
14
    go first, I will.
15
           MR. CHENG: Your Honor, we could probably help provide
    a bit of a road map for us to proceed. There are a lot of
16
17
    problems here, and we do have some suggestions on how to focus
18
    the hearing a little bit to target the main problems.
19
            THE COURT:
                       Okay.
20
           MR. CHENG: So as Your Honor has heard from Ms. Simpson
21
    and her team, there are a myriad of violations of the
22
    settlement agreement, some of which pose very serious risks to
23
    the inmates, the staff, and the community. The life safety
24
    issues, for example, in the A-Pod could themselves be the
25
    focus of an entire hearing.
```

For our purposes, however, our focus is a little narrower. We've recognized for some time that the only way to get the County into compliance with the settlement agreement is to prioritize certain key remedies. The stipulated order in particular covered some of the highest priority issues, and that's why I think it's helpful to start there.

According to the monitor's last report, the defendants missed about 26 of the deadlines in the stipulated order. They met ten, and there are about seven that are not applicable or are pending, or at least that's our count based on her report. So when we're doing this tour this time around, we're focusing on some of those same issues, and we are thinking that a lot of those remedies are sort of the foundation for further improvement in the other big areas.

When the defendants failed to implement some of those express provisions of the stipulated order, in some cases they actually still made some progress with their own ad hoc approaches. We don't want to criticize them for some types of delays that can occur with any complex endeavor or just good faith efforts to implement the stipulated order. We're also sensitive to the fact that the pandemic has complicated things, and, you know, they've had some staffing turnover, which has also made their lives difficult.

So our focus is on the violations that we don't think are justifiable and that need to be addressed right away if

they're going to make progress on critical issues such as staffing and for providing services for the youth and certain elements of mental health care.

I think our concerns fall into two big categories. The first is the County's failure to build expertise and develop the institutional structures needed to address the long-standing staffing issues.

THE COURT: If you would, Mr. Cheng, would you slow down just a little bit.

MR. CHENG: Yes.

So, again, the first big issue is the failure to build expertise and the institutional structures needed to address long-standing staffing issues. They've had a problem for some time with severe staffing turnovers, inexperienced supervisors, and bottlenecks in the criminal justice process, so the settlement and stipulated order included several provisions to address these issues. They include stipulated order 2(b)(4), which required they hire a credentialed corrections recruitment and retention consultant.

Defendants have done very little in this area. Other than a slight pay increase, they have not been working with a consultant to develop strategies for retaining staff, training supervisors to motivate and manage their employees, creating a salary ladder, or any of the other pieces that were built into the stipulated order.

2.1

Stipulated order 4(a)(1) required that this consultant come in within four months, which would have been May 16th, 2020. Our understanding is they just haven't brought anyone in. I believe Ms. Simpson has put a consultant under her own contract, but it's not really clear what the status of that process is. And even though she has a consultant helping her, my understanding is the County has not really been meeting with the consultant or doing any of the things they need to do to get retention under control.

Another provision is the provision regarding the pretrial services program. Within four months they were supposed to hire a full-time employee to oversee development and implementation of the program. The individual had to be certified by the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies, and that certification was supposed to be completed within 12 months.

I believe Ms. Simpson had flagged that the people they were assigning to handle these tasks were often people who had other duties and didn't really have a lot of training on developing pretrial programs. The County, again, just didn't do much here. They just came up with their own solution and hoped it would work, and I think that's one of the reasons they're behind again.

There's also stipulated order 5(a) which said within 30 days they should have posted for a treatment director at

Henley-Young. They didn't post for the correct position until May 20th, and, as Ms. Simpson and Mr. Moeser pointed out, both the executive director and the treatment directors for Henley-Young left in November 2020. So we don't know how they can get into compliance with the agreement when they're not doing the really basic things about hiring the people they're supposed to hire, looking for the expertise they're supposed to find, paying for the people they need to pay for in critical positions so they can then take next steps under the agreement.

THE COURT: What do you say, Mr. Cheng, to -- I assume this is what we're going to hear: We hired a treatment -- we hired somebody under 5(a) and they left. What is it that -- what more -- I'm just asking because I'm assuming that's what I'm going to hear from the County: We hire people; they leave. I guess we need to get to the source of why they're leaving.

MR. CHENG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I mean, you hire a treatment coordinator, and position posted correctly in May of 2020, and here it is February of 2021 and the person is already gone. I think the person stayed there a couple of months at most. The same way we're operating under an interim executive director of the youth facility; right? That person came aboard and they left, and I guess -- you know, so what -- what do you say to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

County's response that I think we're going to hear: We can't make people stay? But the County certainly should not be running people off. I don't know if that's the case. MR. GAYLOR: It's not. THE COURT: Mr. -- I heard Chief -- okay. MR. CHENG: I think as we continue with this week's inspection, that's one of the things we're going to try to find out is why people are leaving and what is causing so much turnover. But I think the history of this case indicates there's a tendency by the County to sort of nominally comply with the provisions of the agreement. They hire someone, they fill a slot, and they report to the Court they've done it. Sometimes they do it, like, right before a hearing. MR. GAYLOR: No. MR. CHENG: But what they haven't done is -- well, I realize they may disagree with that. But what they haven't done is sort of do exactly what they're required to do by the stipulated order. They haven't advertised and advertised for exactly the person they're supposed to hire and then get the people certified who are supposed to be certified. Now, we understand maybe it's difficult to find people who are qualified, maybe they had difficulties finding a psychologist. We have worked with them to try to modify the qualifications for some of these positions so they could

eventually fill those positions, but at a certain point one

has to ask, you know, is there a problem with they're just not paying enough? I mean, there were some concerns early on that the reason they couldn't get a psychologist is they just didn't want to pay for a psychologist. So we modified the requirement to allow them to use a different type of credentialed professional to do it.

When they finally brought in that person, you know, how much empowerment did they give to that person? You know, how -- how much authority did they really let them have to run the program?

I will say that because this type of issue is kind of complicated, thus our segue into sort of the second big category issue. You know, we understand sometimes even if you get the great person, they just leave, all right? We think it's strange that they keep losing critical people all across the board, you know, wardens and captains and executive directors and program directors. We suspect that's partly because there are bigger political issues going on in the County. Something else is going on with the leadership.

But leaving that aside, the second big issue is where is the planning, right? Even if somebody leaves, if you really had a system in place, when that person leaves, there are policies and procedures or something in the works that can be continued by the next person, and so you don't depend heavily on filling the post; you depend on having a plan for

moving ahead.

2.1

And so the second big area is that there seems to be a lack of planning by the county leadership, and that is therefore causing some stress or problem for the facility and for the staff.

To illustrate that a little more clearly, let's talk about, like, for example, the maintenance issue. A-Pod having to be retrofitted is not a surprise. That was built into the stipulated order. Everyone understood when C-Pod was opened, A-Pod would continue in place. They had a plan for how to do that. They brought in outside architects and contractors to make repairs. Our understanding is that all those contractors are now in place, they're submitting work orders, and the whole work order system has broken down at the county level.

There used to be a system where everything went to county administrator; she would decide if things would be paid for and handled by the contractors or should instead be handled by county maintenance. When the county administrator left, that process disappeared. We don't know what happened to it. We're going to have to find out. But if there was any planning up front, they should have known that something like that could happen. That process should have continued with the next county administrator. And to be frank, Your Honor, we flagged this issue with the County when we heard the county administrator was leaving.

THE COURT: Well, I think you're being generous when you say "leaving" and "left." From what I've seen in the newspaper and seen on the news, I said, there was no sort of leaving and left. She was fired. She was terminated. And I'm not taking sides on it at all because we know the Board of Supervisors can do what it wishes to do, but I do think you are being generous when you say that the previous county administrator left.

MR. CHENG: Well, Your Honor, there are times when I really don't want to get too much into the politics of what's going on in Hinds County. My focus is primarily on are they in compliance with the order. I only felt like I had to go into it here because it directly impacted implementation of the agreement. So if they don't have a plan, though, when they know they're going to fire their county administrator, then nobody should be surprised that they're out of compliance with the maintenance when they don't have anything in place to take over.

I wish some of the other issues were surprises, but they're not. The JCA issue has been brewing for some time. We're well aware that the youth court judge, for example, has had some concerns about the number of JCAs, which is why the stipulated order said they had to have programming, they had to bring in a program director. They had have to some effort to address the mental health services, they had to upgrade the

training, they had to do more -- they had to do more to expand those services so that it would go from being a short-term detention facility for basically runaways and other lower-risk youth to being a more long-term facility with JCAs who have more challenging issues. But, again, where's the plan for that, right? There -- there were some efforts to meet the terms of the stipulated order. They brought in a few people, and then nothing. And, you know, despite efforts I think by the monitor to get more information about what they were up to or how they were going to implement programs, tour after tour occurs and we never see anything.

Again, talking about planning, let me just go back to pretrial services as another illustration. They talk about bringing in a pretrial services nonprofit to help them develop assessment forms and a program. We've been talking about pretrial services since last year, and this was supposed to have been done early on. The pretrial service proposal they submitted I think came in last week, and it's not because DOJ and the monitor haven't been asking about it. It's just something that got done at the last minute. And as far as we know, nobody's acted on it.

So just like the maintenance requests, the treatment programs, the pretrial services, things happen. They happen right before the hearing, they happen right before a tour, but there's no indication that anyone at the leadership level has

2.1

a big-picture strategic plan on how they're going to implement even the basic requirements of the stipulated order so that they can then get ahead of all these other problems.

When you don't have key leadership in place and you don't really have a plan at the top levels and you're not really engaged at the highest levels, when a disaster occurs or something bad happens, no one's ready for it. You know, maybe it's the pandemic. Maybe it's a physical plant issue at Jackson which causes them to have to watch everybody and move them to another facility. Maybe it's the loss of the program director or the executive director.

Things like that are going to happen over the course of any endeavor this complicated. The key is that a good, well-run system has some resilience and is able to deal with it because they've been building up the leadership expertise, they value stability in their leadership, and they have a plan for where they're going to go for implementing all these provisions. And I think when those two big pieces of the stipulated order are missing, it's just going to be very, very hard to make progress for the settlement agreement.

I think that in a nutshell is our view on this, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And I guess it's the DOJ's overarching principle this stipulated order is exactly what it is: The parties agreed to these terms, every one of these terms. The

parties worked out this about a year ago to resolve the DOJ's motion for contempt, as I recall; is that right?

MR. CHENG: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And so every one of these things, the parties agreed that this would -- that they could do it and that there would be -- and this is how they would resolve the motion for contempt that the Court was prepared to hear. And I guess, Mr. Cheng, DOJ is now considering at what point in time does it try to resurrect its motion for contempt or find a new one. Is that what I'm hearing?

MR. CHENG: I think that is something we were definitely going to have to think about after this tour. You know, to be honest, Your Honor, they already had their chance. They technically -- when they entered the stipulated order as to avert contempt, they're already on thin ice with the Department as it is.

We have tried to be creative and patient about the County's interim efforts, right. Like, if they can't comply with the settlement agreement, we understand -- if they can't comply with the stipulated order, we have less understanding, but nonetheless if they can come up with a good proposal or a good plan or really have something in place, you know, we might not need to file for contempt.

Our concern is there's nothing really like that, as far as we can tell. Like, there really isn't an effort to satisfy

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the Department's concerns or the monitor's concerns on some of these big issues. It's often sort of a void from the County. We just don't hear very much at all and then something gets done and it's not particularly effective and then we do a site visit and find out things really aren't doing well at all. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cheng. I guess I'll turn it to the County and/or the sheriff. MR. GAYLOR: Yes, Your Honor. This is Tony Gaylor. I'm not sure which portion of the argument you want to hear -- or response you want to hear first. THE COURT: Well, I guess one of the things that concerns me here is this whole situation with Pod C and -well, Pod B not being used; A being used temporarily; and from all indications, A should not be used at all. No -- no doors -- inability to lock the doors, if that's true; if there's leaking in the roof; if the lights are out or -- it just seems to me that you're endangering the inmates. So if there -- and what I've heard is that there's this whole work order problem -- or at least there is a work order problem, and I don't know if work is not being done because people are not being paid or if work is not being done because we don't know who's supposed to do the work. So I guess that's a place to start. How long will those inmates be in Pod A? Because there's never an understanding or an intention that Pod A

2.1

would even be used, from what I've heard today, and if I'm wrong on -- I don't want to leave here under the wrong impression on anything, so if I'm wrong on that, let me know.

MR. GAYLOR: With regard to the repairs -- and,
Attorney Barker, you can chime in when you feel necessary -we retained a construction manager, an expert, to oversee the
repairs that were done to Pod C, Pod B as well. There was not
the intention that Pod A would be in this use for this period
of time, but we -- it is taking us a little bit longer to get
Pod B repaired. Pod C has obviously come back online. We've
got to figure out a way to make the repairs to Pod B as fast
as possible.

THE COURT: When you say "as fast as possible," is there a targeted date at which you expect Pod B to be operable?

MR. GAYLOR: Board President Supervisor Calhoun would like to address that as well.

MR. CALHOUN: Thank you, Your Honor.

I'm sure that, according to the contractor, they would be through with the doors on Pod B within a month or a month and a half. And according to my contractor that's been overseeing the progress on not only the doors but also the repairs to Pod B, we think that's going to be -- come about a month after that.

THE COURT: How long have these repairs for Pod B been

```
going on?
 1
 2
            MR. CALHOUN: Since -- since they finished with the
 3
    Pod C. And then -- they're utilizing Pod C now.
 4
            THE COURT: Okay. And when was that? I'm just trying
 5
    to see how long -- okay. C-Pod -- was C-Pod completed back in
 6
    May?
 7
            MR. CALHOUN: I don't think it was quite through --
            MR. GAYLOR: No.
 8
 9
            MR. CALHOUN: -- at that time.
            MR. GAYLOR: It was the fall.
10
11
            THE COURT: Well, was Pod C repaired on a time schedule
12
    that the County thought it would be repaired, or was there
    some delay in repairing Pod C? Because as I recall, when we
13
    were back here, again going back as far as -- when we were
14
15
    back here last January, there was some indication that the
    people from Texas would be in to finish up the locks on the
16
17
    doors by the spring, I think. Now, I could be wrong, because
18
    I am going off the top of my head.
19
            So -- but did Pod C get fully repaired under the
20
    timeline that the County thought it would be or contracted for
2.1
    it to be?
22
            MR. GAYLOR: Your Honor, I don't believe any repairs
23
    are made absolutely in the timeframe or by the deadlines we
24
    proposed them to be in this past year, because we have been
25
    dealing with some extenuating circumstances. You know, we
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't actually -- we're not operating in -- as if everything is normal, so it does take -- it has been taking a little bit longer to make the repairs that we thought needed to be made. And then there's times when the construction people go into a system and thinking that something needs to be done and more work needs to be done. So it's typical construction type of delays on top of a pandemic. THE COURT: On top of what, sir? MR. CALHOUN: On top of COVID-19. COVID-19 has slowed us up quite a bit, and it's not only with work but also with funds to do the work. THE COURT: So is it -- so, again, is there -- I think, then, I heard from you, Mr. Calhoun, I think you said that you expect Pod B, did I hear you correctly, in about 60 days? MR. CALHOUN: Yes, sir. And that should be well within the range that they told me that it would -- I'm talking about the doors now. The doors should be ready in 60 days, and 30 days after that we should have -- be ready to go on line with Pod B. THE COURT: The 60 days for the doors, the doors are being done by this outfit -- this specialty outfit out of Texas? MR. CALHOUN: Yes, sir. And the other work is done by our folk or other contractors. Mr. Marsh is over that. And what we're talking about is Benchmark Construction was, I

think, okayed by the Court.

MR. GAYLOR: So, Your Honor, let me add also, in the midst of all of this, yes, some of the representations that have been made with regard to the maintenance department has certainly been accurate in the sense that a transition had to have been made, and as that transition has taken place, a lot of things have been discovered that were certainly less than optimum. So we do have some additional delays associated with the maintenance department not being completely up to speed. But since that time, we've also hired a full time — a new full-time maintenance director, who has pledged his efforts to make sure that we can get back online with some of these matters as well.

THE COURT: But until we get Pod B back online, those prisoners in Pod A are at risk because they are in an ill-equipped jail or pod. So every day they're at extra risk for whatever. You can't see what's going on in there because the lights don't work.

MR. GAYLOR: Well, Your Honor, now that the representation has been made, we've got to get the repairs done, Your Honor. But oftentimes -- some of these matters were not completely budgeted for because they're coming in at higher estimates than was given to us initially months ago, and so we have to make presentations back to the board repeatedly for change orders and budget amendments to try and

1 pay for these matters. 2 Quite frankly, it's going to be a bit of a haphazard 3 process because we don't have all of the funds budgeted. We have the funds budgeted, but the estimates have come in a lot 4 5 higher than the budget. So we've got to find money to get all of the rest of these repairs paid for, and that's a challenge. 6 7 THE COURT: I hear you. I understand it's a challenge, but --8 9 MR. GAYLOR: It's certainly not a challenge that we aren't willing to or trying to meet, Your Honor. We are 10 11 having the meetings. The assessments are being done. 12 estimates are coming in higher than they were supposed to be. But we're making repairs and progress in spite of that. 13 It's not happening as fast as we would like for it to. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. Do you wish to address any of the other concerns that have been pointed out by the monitor 16 and/or the Government? 17 18 MR. GAYLOR: I'm going to let the -- I'm going to defer to the sheriff's department on policies, procedures, and other 19 matters associated with the detention centers. 20 2.1 THE COURT: Ms. Barker. 22 MS. BARKER: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 23 I have a couple -- I'll try to respond as succinctly as 24 possible to the DOJ and to the monitor's concerns. 25 First of all with staffing, yes, staffing has been a

2.1

problem, and it has continued to be a problem, especially within this last year given the challenges that we face with COVID. It's been a little bit difficult to hire people who want to come and work in a detention center, in a closed setting. However, we have been hiring quite a few people.

The Department of Justice stated that we failed to retain a retention consultant, which is simply not true. He was retained, and he is getting paid from the monitor's budget. We retained him in January of 2020. He came and made one initial site visit prior to COVID.

And -- however, what I will admit to is that the recruit -- I mean, the recruit and retention expert officer that we hired, we recently realized that the job is a little too big for his skill set and we need someone with a lot more experience in this issue. Because we can hire, but it is a problem keeping detention officers. And the sheriff and our staff have recognized that, and we are trying to address that problem.

Now, we have -- I'm sorry. I'm hearing a little bit of feedback. I don't know if that's something on my computer or not. Do y'all hear feedback?

THE COURT: I hear you fine.

MS. BARKER: Okay. I just wanted to make sure.

We have advertised publicly and also as well as inside for a recruit and retention expert, and we are going to

require some level of experience, a college graduate is -- or a college degree is also one of the qualifications. And once that person gets on board, we will be working very closely with Matt Rivera. That has been kind of an issue in the past, and I do know that the fact that Matt can't be here on-site and talk to some of the employees and kind of gather a feel for the overall, I guess, work space here has kind of been a problem. But we do recognize that that is an issue, especially with retention, and we are working on that.

Let's see. I'm trying to address this in the way that the Court...

As far as policies and procedures go, Your Honor, I share your sentiments as far as why it's taking so long to get words on a page. I believe that Monitor Simpson alluded to the fact that Karen Albert has been very helpful, although her approach in drafting these policies I think has proved to be something of -- it's a longer process, and in the last couple of months, I've reached out to Ms. Albert and Monitor Simpson and we've discussed -- and I was just very candid with

Ms. Albert that, number one, we don't have the staff to take away and to do a seven hour -- you know, she would come in and do an entire week worth of policy drafting. We don't have the staff to take away a week from their job to do that.

Secondly, the staff that we have, unfortunately, just does not have that skill set. And it was coming -- it was

starting to be a burdensome process in that it was really having an effect on the morale of our employees. So what we have done is identified two people, Captain Johnson and the assistant to the jail administrator, Melody Clayton, who are in charge of keeping up with the policies and procedures, helping draft those.

So rather than have a big group and a lot of time taken to dedicate to one policy, we have tried to streamline that.

And since that has been done, policies have been coming out a lot quicker. I do -- I realize that having 25 policies when we're supposed to have perhaps 70 or 60 is a problem, but I -- we have identified that, and we're working to streamline that process.

Let's see. As far as training and implementing those policies, that is another area in which we are trying to address as well and get stronger, and we do need to do more training. It has been difficult, though, with the turnover that we have had, so -- and also with COVID, it's difficult to get everyone together in one training class. We're trying to implement these policies by training during roll call. So that is something that we are very -- we realize that we have to work on.

Something that -- actually, speaking of staffing, we've actually had a net gain in staffing. Since January of 2020 to date, we've hired a total of 115 and we've lost 67. So we

2.1

actually had a net gain of about 58 as far as staffing goes, and I think that that's something that is -- should be commendable given the fact that we are in a pandemic and we are -- this is a detention -- this is a jail that not necessarily a lot of people want to come work in for the pay especially.

As far as incidents go, we've also had a decreased number of incidences from last year. The total number of detainees has gone down by 19 percent, and the -- we've decreased detainee escape by about 86 percent from last year -- I mean, I'm sorry, from 2019. There has been a decreased inmate-on-inmate assault by 34 percent, and there's also been a decreased inmate-on-detention-officer assault by 16 percent. And overall the decreased use of force has gone down by 39 percent. And that was taken from just the number of incident reports that were recorded in 2019 and also with 2020 and compared those.

So I think that there are some issues that we definitely need to tackle, that we are very aware of. We are in the process of tackling those. However, overall, from what the sheriff's office can control, I believe that we have done pretty good under the circumstances.

THE COURT: Let me ask you about what the sheriff's office can control. Ms. Simpson mentioned that there were several indications of the use of -- I think Mr. Parrish

also -- the use of OC spray inappropriately, but nobody -- I think -- I think I heard this right. There's no indication that anyone has been disciplined in any way for violating that rule.

You certainly have total control over discipline, and I'm just trying to figure out how does that happen? If there is this violation that they say that has occurred that they say is reflected in the incident reports and that everybody's cleared at every instance, how can that be explained?

MS. BARKER: Your Honor, I understand it looks like there's a systemwide failure based on what the monitors have said and the fact that no one has been disciplined. The only thing that I can chalk that up to -- our defense is that we simply just need more training. It's very difficult to change the culture of the environment that's been -- that's done something a certain way for so many years. Even if we do have new people that come in, there's still some --

THE COURT: I think -- hold on. Hold on, Ms. Barker.

I don't think it's that difficult. I mean, I really don't.

But even if it is, with the rate of turnover that you-all say that you had, at least in the past, very few of these people are part of that culture from years ago, because they're no longer there, and I know they've trained the people who are there, but what I've been hearing over the last couple of years, there's a lot of turnover, you can't find people.

But when the rules are violated and management has an opportunity to do something about -- and management has changed over the last two years. New management came on board in January 2000 -- 2020, excuse me. So management has changed. But that -- and you tell me that there are still issues with people using OC in an offensive way, and they shouldn't be.

MR. BARKER: Your Honor, the sheriff would like to address the Court, if that's okay.

THE COURT: Okay.

2.1

SHERIFF VANCE: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Goof afternoon.

SHERIFF VANCE: As far as the disciplinary issues that we're discussing right now, I don't know exactly where -- if I would agree that no one has been disciplined. I can think of one case in particular myself where we had pictures of a detention officer actually using OC spray against a detainee that I knew myself and I decided myself was inappropriate, and I know for a fact that particular detention officer was disciplined. So I would question that -- respectfully, that nobody has been disciplined. I don't have the exact numbers at my fingertips.

I would also add that dealing with disruptive, combative detainees is a challenge, for -- especially when you have staff shortages where perhaps you have one detention

officer have to confront individuals that will not take simple instruction, like going back into their cells. I think that training is definitely a part of the solution for that problem.

That particular thing is also challenged by the fact that, as counsel stated, we've hired over a hundred people in the last year, but we've lost about 60 people. So there's a constant need for maturation for detention officers, for training for detention officers, because we still -- even though we've turned it over quite a bit trying to reach our required number, people who come into a facility like that, they're going to constantly have to be trained. They will not necessarily respond the same way a more seasoned detention officer would. But we're losing a lot of our people that do have that seasoning, and we're going to have to bring up through training the new people that we're hiring. So I would suggest that it's a process that we're trying to adhere to.

THE COURT: Thank you, Sheriff Vance.

SHERIFF VANCE: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Ms. Barker, I know I cut across you. You were saying some other things.

MS. BARKER: I think that the sheriff pretty much touched on all the issues as far as trying to discipline our own. You know, he's correct, we have fired and disciplined a lot of officers for use of force, so there might have been one

or two that maybe IAD for whatever reason found that it was acceptable, but I think that the statement that we haven't done anything is a misstatement.

THE COURT: I assume the records will speak for themselves, then. So once we see the records, we'll go from there, to the extent it becomes an issue.

I guess with respect to a plan going forward, we've -I've heard a lot today.

MR. GAYLOR: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. GAYLOR: If I may add also, with regard to the matters that are taking place at Henley-Young, if I may remind the Court we're also under another consent decree with regard to that facility, and one of the things that has taken place with that facility, we've been working with the monitor that is in place over that facility, Ms. Anne Nelson, trying to comply with the stipulated order in place on that facility, and it -- as you noted, we have hired a treatment director, a training director, and an executive director.

We do have some turnover problems with regard to that, and we talked with the treatment director as to why she was leaving her post, and one of the things that was mentioned to us is that, quite frankly, right now as a result of -- as a result of the pandemic, the economy for licensed clinical social workers and licensed clinical psychologists has changed

in the sense that they can make as much, if not more, money treating patients via Zoom rather than being on-site at a facility all day. And so we've had some challenges trying to hire a licensed clinical social worker to fill that treatment director's spot, although we are encouraged that the training director has been doing some decent work.

The interim executive director is someone who has been at the facility for some time, and so there's no unfamiliarity with the issues that are taking place down there, and we're trying to get them addressed through him.

We anticipate hiring an executive director, a permanent -- a more permanent executive director, as soon as more qualified applicants make themselves available, but we're not exactly sure when that will be completed.

With regard to educational services, I have to push back on the representation being made that no -- or that educational services aren't being offered. I think we should also be mindful of the fact that no in-person education took place within the district over nine months, and so, you know, with regard to any child in that school district, in or out of the facility, they are receiving their educational through -- whether it's through work packets or even through some distance learning. All of the residents received tablets from the school district so that that could be implemented as well, but --

2.1

THE COURT: Was it implemented? I mean, if people couldn't come in and teach them like they used to do during this pandemic, were they -- were the students receiving the education that they needed and that -- the education that was available to everybody else? I mean, did they receive that education?

MR. GAYLOR: They received tablets for the students outside of the facility. Now, with regard to there being many disruptions that have taken place over that period of time, we certainly can't argue that there haven't been disruptions. There have been disruptions with regard to incidents that have taken place between residents. There have been disruptions with regard to technology, disruptions with regard to the water system, and a lot of different things that have taken place to disrupt learning over the course of the last year. However, we cannot say that we have not been making good faith attempts to educate the students that are down there, because we have.

We do have some staffing shortages down there because the turnover, and so there are times in which we have to make some adjustments with regard to whether or not in-person learning can take place. We cannot say that, you know, that has not -- that has been optimum, but we have been making good faith attempts.

THE COURT: What level of education had the children

been receiving? I mean, that's the ultimate question. I understand there's been disruptions, and I understand you say the County -- that they're doing everything that they can possibly do. Were these kids getting any type of education? Was it once a week, was it one hour a day every day during the week? Was it five days a week? I mean, did they -- have they been taught anything since the pandemic?

MR. GAYLOR: Absolutely, Your Honor. And in fact, in-person learning was taking place at Henley-Young before in-person learning took place within the system at all. So, yes, learning has been taking place and teaching has been taking place, but I'm not going to make the representation that no disruptions have taken place over the course of the last year. Of course they have. But they have been going to school. They have been receiving assignments. They have been taught. But, you know, those aren't the best of circumstances down there in many instances. We won't dispute that. There's a principal on-site, and there's teachers that come every day.

THE COURT: Let me -- Ms. Barker, let me ask you this question, because I don't think this has been addressed by anybody on your side of the table; that is, the County, and I think this is in the hands of the sheriff, so that's why I'm asking you about this administrative segregation -- the administrative segregation issue that the monitors have pointed out, persons being placed in administrative

segregation for extended period of time. 1 2 MS. BARKER: Yes. 3 THE COURT: Do you agree that is happening? MS. BARKER: Well, Your Honor, they are placed in 4 5 administrative segregation for violent crimes, and their cases are reviewed weekly to see if they should stay there or not. 6 7 THE COURT: For violent crimes that occur within the institution? 8 9 MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor. And in very extreme circumstances, if they're a danger to other inmates or a 10 danger to our staff and continued disciplinary issue. 11 12 THE COURT: The monitor seems to suggest that there's 13 either several of them or that they stay in there for extended period of times without -- I quess without an attempt to 14 15 return to the regular population. I don't need to speak for you, Ms. Simpson or 16 17 Mr. Parrish. You know, again, please make sure I'm saying the 18 right thing. MS. BARKER: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I was getting 19 20 information from our jail administrator. 2.1 At any given time, from what I understand, we have 22 between about four to ten inmates in the administrative 23 segregation, and their cases are reviewed, from what I 24 understand, weekly to see if they are safe enough to be placed 25 back in general population.

MS. SIMPSON: Your Honor, I was just trying to find the segregation report in the documents that have been uploaded, and I'm not finding it quickly. My understanding is there's significantly more people in administrative segregation than four to ten. That might be disciplinary segregation, but the administrative segregation is typically much higher. But I will try to find that report.

And, Dave Parrish, I don't know if you have that -better handle on that number off the top of your head, the
number of people in administrative segregation.

MR. PARRISH: No, I don't have current figures right at hand. I'm sorry.

MS. SIMPSON: I can try to get that to you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I guess the bottom line -well, no. Let me ask since I do have -- and I appreciate the
DA -- Mr. District Attorney for getting here, and I do know
that the DA had a press conference about two weeks ago, I
guess, talking about the first year of his tenure.

I only saw and read the little bit that I saw and read, Mr. Owens. I did not attend the press conference, so I didn't hear everything or I did not read all that you said, but I got the impression that the State is -- or at least indicting not necessarily more people but at least the process is now moving, you're getting more and that way -- you're processing cases now, and in that regard the next step would be trying to

2.1

get those matters resolved through guilty plea or some going to trial. Is there anything you wish to tell the Court?

MR. OWENS: Good afternoon, Your Honor.

I think the Court properly summarized one of the things that we expressed in our year in review. I'd say that in 2020, in January, we had two backlogs both equally affecting the consent decree and the Hinds County Jail, independent of COVID and those challenges.

One backlog was just hundreds of indictments that we found in rooms that we were not meeting the Mississippi Supreme Court constitutional rights of defendants in ensuring that we indict individuals who had been arrested within 90 days, and because of that, you had this huge backlog where people were coming in and out that created complete dysfunction in the jail and also inhibited our ability to prosecute cases. And 90 days is generally the best practices nationwide, as I understand it, Your Honor, from arrest to indictment, which includes a thorough investigation. We have met that hurdle. We conquered that. We are indicting all cases in 90 days.

But because of the other backlog, which is our inability to prosecute cases, which are the best national standards, which is a year's time from arrest to adjudication of the case, in this county, Your Honor, we're closer to two and a half and sometimes three years for a myriad of factors.

That's our challenge right now. That's certainly impacting the jail population and the larger population of JACs independent of the new challenges that were presented because of COVID.

I would highlight something the Court said I guess about an hour ago. We had a jury trial set yesterday which we needed 48 jurors to select a jury from. We only had 26 people show up. That's occurred at least 12 to 14 times over the last year, Your Honor, where we just could not move forward.

And one of the reasons that's really impactful, Your Honor, is not just because of those 12 or so triers, but our inability to have trials means defendants, particularly the most violent population that's in the jail that, as I understand it, is wreaking the most problems, we're giving them serious time, Your Honor. I mean, if you take a life in our county, it's a minimum 30 years, if not life, or 40 years. There's no incentive to plea, and that's something that we can't get around right now.

I will tell the Court, I want you to know that both the sheriff and the Board of Supervisors are meeting regularly with this. I am getting a weekly and monthly list of individuals at the jail. Where we can not violate public safety and reduce bonds or use the least restrictive means, we do so, and we've been pretty successful in that, particularly at the height of COVID. But because the City of Jackson and

```
1
     our county had almost 140 murders last year and this year we
     already are at 17, I believe -- we had four last weekend -- we
 2
    are in an untenable situation of being able to deal with that
 3
     level of crime.
 4
 5
            We are proposing some pretty significant solutions.
     I'm going to meet with the board next week as well as the City
 6
7
    of Jackson, which I think is a significant part of this
     conversation, too, because the City --
 8
 9
            THE COURT: Oh, we lost everybody. It's something that
    happened with us, I think.
10
11
                  (A brief recess was taken.)
12
            MR. OWENS: And, Your Honor, if I could add one more
13
     thing, I'm not sure --
            THE COURT: Hold on. Hold on, Mr. -- did everybody
14
15
    hear Mr. Owens that entire period? Because the Court -- we've
    been off. The Court has been off, so I haven't -- I think,
16
17
    Mr. Owens, the last thing that I heard from you was that,
18
     Judge, we have a solution -- or I'm presenting a solution to
19
     the Board of Supervisors and -- I guess, and the sheriff, and
20
     I guess you might have said JPD. I don't know. But I'm
21
    presenting -- I have something that I'm presenting to them
22
    because we've had all of these murders here in Hinds County
23
     last year and even the four who were homicides last week, and
24
     then it went out on this end, and I know that's been about
25
     three minutes ago and you said a lot. But if you will, at
```

least try to bring me up to speed.

MR. OWENS: Yes, Your Honor, and add one more thing to that. I think that was most of it frankly, Your Honor. You know, we're not staffing all the courts in Hinds County.

We're not staffing the city courts. The District Attorney's Office is not. It's only the Public Defender's Office. We have to kind of stop the flow of traffic in the jail. I think there are a lot of people going to the jail we can keep from going to the jail. That's one of the initiatives that we're trying to enroll currently.

But the JACs, which I understand is a big concern on this call, Your Honor, those individuals who are at Henley-Young who are charged as adults, their case time is the same case time as every individual who's charged in Hinds County. I know it might seem like that those cases are delayed, but it's the same case time. We're seeing them come up. I think both Judge McDaniels and Judge Hicks, and certainly Judge Green with her diversion program, have advocated that we make sure we're not forgetting about those individuals, but it's not that they're being forgotten. We're recognizing those on the jail list that are provided to the District Attorney's Office, and we're making sure we prioritize those cases as well.

THE COURT: Are there any -- and the sheriff would know this. Are there any persons who would ordinarily be in state

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
custody being housed currently in Hinds County? Are there any
MDOC defendants there still? I know at one time there was,
and I know there was an effort to make sure that MDOC came and
retrieved their folk.
       MS. BARKER: Right now I'm being told that we have 31
individuals and that 18 individuals are ready to go to MDOC
and the remaining are here for court orders. So we will work
with MDOC to come and pick up those inmates. It hasn't --
it's been a process to get them to come pick up the inmates,
but I know that our classifications officer reaches out to
them -- I don't know if its weekly or monthly, but, yeah, we
do need to get those out of the system. Weekly, I'm being
told.
       THE COURT: That returns us to Mr. -- I'm sorry,
Mr. Owens. Were you through?
       MR. OWENS: Yes, Your Honor, unless the Court has any
specific questions to what we're doing or instruction to how
we might do what we're doing better.
       THE COURT: Okay. Well, I mean, that basically gets us
back to the starting point of Mr. Cheng's probing issue, I
quess. The -- there's still -- there's still not full or
substantial or in some cases no compliance with various terms
of the stipulated order. And I can't underscore the word
```

"stipulated" enough because this was the promises that the

parties made that they could hold up. It's just like any

other contract, settlement agreement. It's like any other thing. You do this, I promise to do that, you get this.

So I -- you know, how do the parties anticipate -- I mean, this is -- again, I picked up this matter in January of 2019. I believe that was my first hearing with the parties. And I regret to say that, you know, we're still dealing with some issues that came up that were apparent when I inherited this matter.

Is there any point in time that the County wishes to be out from up under a consent decree that's monitored by a court? I mean, that's what it's going to boil down to.

At some point in time -- you know, the County's you know, paying money for monitors; the County is doing -- you know, doing other things. At some point in time, I assume the County's not -- does not wish to be up under a court order to do the things that it's supposed to do. So I guess when does the County want that to happen?

MR. GAYLOR: Your Honor, if I may attempt to answer some of that, without question the County does not wish to continue to be under a consent decree order for a prolonged period of time, but I must say that, you know, with regard to certain matters, there are certainly attempts that are being made to come out from under the stipulated order or comply with the stipulated order, and then there are times when things happen that become setbacks. We hire people.

Sometimes they leave. You know, I would like to know if -- or to what level some type of grace is given to the County for its attempts to comply and when we make hires and then those people leave.

There are times when maintenance issues are resolved and then those matters get broken. When you talk about cameras that are being installed, well, sometimes those cameras get broken as a result of (AUDIO GAP). Doors get repaired, but sometimes those doors get broken and jimmied open again, and then those repairs have to be made again. And so I'm hoping that some level of assistance can be given to the County with regard to attempts to comply with the orders, because things do intervene at times, and certainly this year has been a very, very challenging year.

What hasn't been brought up over the course of this call -- or status conference is the fact that we have -- we lose personnel from time to time as a result of the diagnosis of COVID. We've lost employees for weeks at a time on multiple occasions, and so that has also presented a challenge in the continuity of trying to meet the demands of the order. And I don't think those things can risk being overlooked, because they're real. And oftentimes the people who are in charge of complying, or in charge of trying to get us in compliance, they come up sick, you know. And so I don't think that this has been an ordinary year in any way, shape, or

form, but we are making attempts to comply with the stipulated order that we agreed to over a year ago.

MS. BARKER: Your Honor, and I would just like to piggyback on what Attorney Gaylor has said. Yes, if this was the same day and time of December 20-something, whenever we entered into this order, do I think we would be compliant in it? Yes, I do. However, it's not. A new sheriff's administration came in. We were -- you know, and I know the County, we were all on board.

COVID hit. Our lives came to a halt. Nobody knew how to deal with this in detention services. People -- our employees were hospitalized, key employees, and the fact -- yes, we did not meet every deadline, and there are some we are deficient in, but we've done a lot of it under the circumstances.

And I understand the DOJ's frustrations; I understand the Court's frustrations. However, we have, you know, had improvements, and the fact that we've done anything and there hasn't been a complete breakout in the jail with COVID or that, you know, we've totally failed on every avenue is amazing given the resources that we have, given the staffing that we have, and, you know, given what we have faced, I mean, not only professionally, personally. People are -- this is just a difficult year.

So for the DOJ to say they will renew their motion for

```
contempt, they have every right to do that; however, this is
1
 2
    not the same playing field as it was whenever we sat in your
    courtroom in December of '19.
 3
            THE COURT: Well, let me ask this question. DOJ will
 4
 5
    have -- I don't think they actually said that they would do
     that, but they'll have an opportunity to do whatever they
 6
 7
    wish.
            But since Pod C has been repaired, have there been any
 8
 9
    breakdowns of the locks anymore in Pod C? In Pod C? Did --
     in other words, did the people from out in Texas come do the
10
11
     job and did that fix the door issue? Because that had been a
12
     running issue about the doors.
13
            MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor.
            THE COURT: So no more doors have been broken in Pod C?
14
15
           MS. BARKER: Correct.
16
            THE COURT: Okay. So that's one big thing that has
    been resolved, then; right?
17
18
            MS. BARKER: That's -- that's huge, yes.
19
            THE COURT: That's huge. So, again, I would expect
20
     them to do that in Pod B really soon.
2.1
            MS. BARKER: Yes, sir, that's what our expectation is.
    It would be great, because our staff and our inmates are --
22
23
    the safety and security of them are at issue, and it's a very
24
    big concern.
25
            MR. GAYLOR: We've also communicated with our
```

2.1

construction manager during the course of this hearing, and it's our understanding that some repairs to the doors in Pod B are supposed to be made by the end of the month as well, by the end of February. And so we are making the attempt to get things in order so that that place can be habitable.

I think it should also be noted that over the course of the last year, our inmate resident population has gone up significantly as well. So that would have an impact on the housing arrangements; that would have an impact on staffing issues and everything else.

THE COURT: It has gone up because JDC has moved out there? Because I don't think the County now is holding people for misdemeanors. Has crime jumped up -- I mean, you know, have that many more arrests been made, or are we talking about the RDC -- more people out at the RDC because JDC has closed?

MR. GAYLOR: I believe the representation can be made that more arrests have been made. I will let the sheriff's

SHERIFF VANCE: Your Honor?

department answer that, though.

THE COURT: Yes, I'm here. Yes.

SHERIFF VANCE: Yes, sir. We've been pretty successful in trying to keep the number consistent. It has gone up some, but we're able to manage despite the fact that the JDC has been closed down. And -- but, again, it's difficult to predict because of the turnover, the large turnover, that

2.1

we're having with our detention officers. But our staff has been able to manage.

I failed to mention the other time, we're starting another class of detention officer candidates next week.

We're also getting ready to find us a recruiter. The first two that we hired just, frankly, did not work out or underachieved, so we are -- we have accepted the fact that constant hiring as far as detention officers are concerned is going to be a way of life for us. We've accepted that. And so we will be constantly hiring as long as we can find suitable candidates.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Simpson, did I hear you correctly that -- I think typically we would do this call at the end of the week after you've done everything for your "site visit." As I appreciate it, you're still doing your site visit now. I think you said you're at least doing some stuff today or tomorrow or whatever. So we're on the front end of your site visit; is that right?

MS. SIMPSON: That's correct. We started it yesterday and have interviews scheduled through Thursday. I think we'll probably have to add a few rescheduled interviews on Friday, so we should be completed sometime on Friday other than additional documents that we might need to review.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

Mr. Cheng for the Government, do you have any, I guess, final words or observations you wish to make?

MR. CHENG: Yes, Your Honor. I think we could probably get into a big argument about what's going on or not going on and there would be a big fact dispute. But I think even from what you've heard from the County this afternoon, there are some concessions here that I think are relevant to how we'd look at the stipulated order and noncompliance not only with the stipulated order but with the settlement agreement itself, which, just as a reminder, is also a lawful agreement that they stipulated to when they signed it.

You hear both the district attorney and the county folks talking about how they've been having these separate meetings about how to get the criminal justice process working and about how there's a backlog in getting people tried and how that breaks the entire system. We knew that when we entered a stipulated order, which is why there's an entire provision on creating a pretrial services program and using the CJCC to help to deal with these problems.

Now, I appreciate that folks are sort of on their own going out there and dealing with this stuff, but where's the big-picture, long-term planning for trying to deal with these problems? How do they get all the parties together through the mechanisms that have been developed under decree to get these problems fixed? So that goes back to the concern about

the long-term planning.

And then, of course, we've got the short-term planning issues. These maintenance issues that they're talking about, you know, I know the County -- you know, I'm grateful to them for being candid and admitting that there are lighting issues and that there are these other problems in A and B-Pod, but these didn't just sort of happen today. These were issues that they've known in some form were prevalent throughout Raymond when the stipulated order was entered.

So once they started moving people around and they knew there were these sort of emergency physical plant issues, what were the short-term plans to deal with the lack of lighting or fire safety problems or the many other issues that are showing up now?

I guess what I'm saying is that while I understand and appreciate their difficulties, I do think, you know, they're accepting a state of affairs that they shouldn't accept.

There needs to be sort of high-level executive leadership and planning to deal with these things.

I do want to mention a COVID issue since that got brought up. I actually felt kind of bad watching them

Ms. Barker, the sheriff, and other key administrators in the office not wearing their masks. This isn't the first time this has happened. I do want to make it clear that although we're asking for meetings with all these folks, we don't want

anyone to do anything that is unsafe and that they should still follow their own policies for COVID prevention, and we don't want to suggest anyone should break it for this site visit.

I will mention, however, that while we're still looking at the COVID issue, we do have some concerns about the quality of the COVID testing and the sort of protocols for contact tracing, which we're going to ask the monitor to look into. I think Dr. Dudley is looking into that issue. We understand they don't have a lot of positive tests, but, you know, I don't think it's a surprise to Your Honor that there have been some articles indicating that the state of Mississippi hasn't been particularly good about statewide testing. We are not making this the highest priority issue just because we understand everyone is having difficulties with COVID right now, but we did want to flag that as a concern.

In addition to the plan timetable issue, I also want to ask if the Court could consider setting another hearing. We do find that when there are these hearings, it does make people focus a little more on the immediate reforms. We heard the County today talk about how they're going to get the doors fixed, B fixed, A fixed.

I personally -- I think the Department has some concerns about whether that's really going to happen on the timeframes mentioned here during this hearing. I think the

concern is sort of based on this sort of long-standing history where, you know, promises are made, but then things don't really get done when they're promised. But we also know even from this initial site visit that there are already some issues that are creeping up in the interviews that we should flag to the Court.

One is that the maintenance staff, there was such turnover in the maintenance staff and a complete reorganization of the county maintenance department that may end up delaying some of the reforms.

Another issue is budgetary. Our understanding is that the construction manager has already submitted proposals for getting a lot of these things fixed. But there was apparently quite a bit of cost overrun in the last round of repairs, and that has been giving the Board of Supervisors concerns. If that remains a problem, then those big-picture repairs are going to be delayed as well.

And, finally, there's issue with the staffing. At least based on the initial interviews, it sounds like the state Department of Corrections is recruiting for \$30,000-per-year starting salaries for state prison staff.

The detention staff in Hinds County I believe start at around 27,000 at the jail, and they start much lower than that at the Henley-Young facility.

So, you know, these things are all sort of out there.

2.1

I know the monitor hasn't had to deal with it yet because she's still assessing it. But I think we can proffer to the Court that there's every reason to believe that absent, you know, close scrutiny by this court, the problems are going to remain, and they're not going to be fixed right away. So I think that is in a nutshell sort of our view on this matter, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I did -- I'm glad you mentioned the COVID, because I did have my questions there to the County and the sheriff with respect to that issue. I heard Ms. Barker say there has not been an outbreak. How much testing -- formal testing and tracing is the County doing? Is the sheriff doing any testing and tracing?

MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor. We're only testing if an employee -- I mean, if an inmate complains of COVID symptoms or if they are symptomatic. And we've tested -- the last positive -- the last positive test that we had was

January 31st. Since then we have had probably about 15 more tests done. They've all been negative. And so that has -- like I said, we're not testing every single inmate, but those that are symptomatic, we are testing. And no one has had to be treated for severe flu-like symptoms, or no one has gone to the hospital for any COVID symptoms or illness.

THE COURT: And that protocol that you're operating under, is that the protocol that the state Department of

```
Health has suggested or authorized?
1
 2
           MS. BARKER: It is, Your Honor. Our medical provider,
 3
    QCHC, is -- we're following their protocol as well as the
 4
    state Department of Health's protocol.
 5
            THE COURT: Has there been any attempt to test all of
    the inmates out there? I know that was done at another
 6
7
    facility. Have all the inmates under your custody been
    tested?
 8
           MS. BARKER: Your Honor, last year we did do mass
    testing of all the inmates in our custody. Of course, it was
10
11
    voluntary, and I think from that there was a very low
12
    number -- I think that maybe (AUDIO GAP) -- I don't want to
13
    give you wrong numbers, Your Honor. We've presented it to the
    Court before. But there was a relatively low number of
14
15
    inmates who tested positive in that group.
            THE COURT: With respect to the use of masks and
16
    sanitizing soap and sanitizers, are the inmates provided with
17
18
    masks?
19
           MS. BARKER: Yes, Your Honor. They're presented with
20
    masks and soap, and from my understanding is that the masks
2.1
    are -- they have the option of changing out the masks about
22
    weekly.
23
            THE COURT: Biweekly, or did you say "about weekly"?
24
           MS. BARKER: Biweekly, Your Honor.
25
            THE COURT: Twice in a week or once every other week?
```

```
MS. BARKER: Once every other week.
 1
 2
            THE COURT: What type of masks are these? N95 or cloth
 3
    or paper? What type?
           MS. BARKER: It's a combination, Your Honor. It's
 4
 5
    really whatever based on our resources and what we have on
 6
    hand.
 7
            THE COURT: Has there been any talk about trying to
    provide masks more frequently than -- you said one mask, so
 8
 9
    one mask every other week. So an inmate gets about two masks
    a month.
10
11
           MS. BARKER: Your Honor, we are dealing -- we are
12
    trying to ration the -- I don't want use the word "ration."
    We are dealing with the resources that we have as far as the
13
    masks. If we had one that we can give them every single day,
14
    a new mask, that would be wonderful. Right now I don't think
15
16
    that's the --
17
            THE COURT: Are you providing the employees with a mask
18
    every other week?
19
            MS. BARKER: Employees have their own mask. Or if they
20
    need one, we will supply them one.
2.1
            THE COURT: That just does not sound as sanitary to me
    as it should. I don't know. I'll talk with the health
22
23
    officers about that and allow them to chime in at some point
24
    in time, but that just doesn't sound the best for a place that
25
    you cannot social distance and a place where hygiene is not
```

optimum. It just -- I mean, it just sounds that way to me, but, hey, I'm sitting here.

I know we got off track with respect to our meeting times because, again, we have not met since last June. If we get back on the same schedule that we were operating under prior to December, that the monitors would submit a report to the Court from this review which they expect to end by the end of this week, Ms. Simpson, that -- you would submit that report when? Is it 60 or 90 days?

MS. SIMPSON: It is -- I submit it to the parties

30 days after the end of the site visit, and then I believe
there's ten working days for the parties to review it and get
any revisions back to me or any suggestions. And then it
usually takes me a few days after that to incorporate those.

So it ends up being probably 45 days.

THE COURT: Okay. In that case, I will suggest that our next meeting be 60 days from today, or I'm saying 60 days. April 9th, which is a Friday, at 10:00 a.m. And right now we'll plan for it to be in this same format, Zoom. I just don't expect things to have lightened up anyway by then. So we'll do it by then.

And I will expect to hear real good news on this Pod B and Pod A situation. I would expect to hear it. I mean, unfortunately, I won't be able to see it, but I did find that my visit was helpful to me. But I can tell you this: I will

```
not be visiting the detention center during the era of COVID,
1
 2
    so you don't have to worry about that.
 3
           MR. CHENG: Your Honor?
 4
           THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Cheng.
 5
           MR. CHENG: May I make a suggestion?
           THE COURT: Yes.
 6
 7
           MR. CHENG: The -- Benchmark actually produced videos
 8
    of the repairs. They provided it to the monitoring team. It
 9
    might be helpful if they could submit a report and a video for
    the hearing. If in theory everything is fixed in 60 days, the
10
11
    architects should be able to submit photographs and videos of
12
    that.
13
           THE COURT: Yeah. The monitors could request it and
    get to me anything that they think I need to see. That's a
14
15
    good idea. I mean, you know, so -- yeah.
           Is there anything else we need to cover?
16
17
           All right. Well, Counsel, I appreciate your
18
    participation. Thank you for making yourselves available, and
    the Court will see you back on April 9th and continue to work
19
    with each other.
20
           That concludes all that the Court has. The Court is
2.1
22
    now adjourned.
    *******************
23
24
25
```

COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Candice S. Crane, Certified Court Reporter,
Registered Professional Reporter in and for the State of
Mississippi, Official Court Reporter for the United States
District Court, Southern District of Mississippi, do hereby
certify that the above and foregoing pages contain a full,
true, and correct transcript of the proceedings had in the
forenamed case at the time and place indicated, which
proceedings were stenographically recorded by me to the best
of my skill and ability.

I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the United States.

THIS the 24th day of February, 2021.

/s/ Candice S. Crane, RPR CPR

Candice S. Crane, RPR, CCR
Official Court Reporter
United States District Court
Candice Crane@mssd.uscourts.gov

2.4